

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

BULLETIN

Vol. XI

April, 1925

No. 2

**The Addresses at the
Eleventh Annual Meeting
January 8-10, 1925**

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY

Executive Secretary of the Association

Published by

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

February, April, May and November

Annual Subscription, \$3.00.

Entered as second class matter, May 13, 1922, at the post office at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT:

President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.

VICE-PRESIDENT:

President Aurelia H. Reinhardt, Mills College.

SECRETARY-TREASURER:

President Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

Dean F. W. Chandler, University of Cincinnati.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

1914 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *constitution adopted.*

1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College.

1916 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College.

1917 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College, *absent overseas.*

President Hill M. Bell, Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding.*

1918 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

1919 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University.

1920 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

1921 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University.

1922 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College, *absent in Europe.*

President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding.*

1923 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

1924 Chancellor James H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

* Deceased.

REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

One year—Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo.

Two years—President John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College.

Three years—President W. D. Scott, Northwestern University.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:

One year—President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE:

Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan, Chairman.

President Mary E. Woolley, Mt. Holyoke College.

President W. M. Lewis, George Washington University.

Dean P. P. Boyd, University of Kentucky.

President J. H. T. Main, Grinnell College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN THE FINE ARTS:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, Chairman.

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

President W. W. Guth, Goucher College.

President R. M. Hughes, Miami University.

President Frederick P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ATHLETICS:

Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Chairman.

Secretary F. D. Fackenthal, Columbia University.

Professor Robert T. Hinton, Georgetown College.

President Paul D. Moody, Middlebury College.

President C. A. Richmond, Union University.

COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

Vice-President Trevor Arnett, University of Chicago,
Chairman.

Dr. George F. Zook, United States Bureau of Education.

Comptroller George C. Wintringer, Princeton University.

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

Director Charles R. Mann, American Council on Education.

COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM:

Secretary Clyde Furst, The Carnegie Foundation,
Chairman.

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University.

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City.

President Irving Maurer, Beloit College.

Professor C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College.

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:

Dean E. H. Wilkins, University of Chicago, Chairman.

President Robert E. Vinson, Western Reserve University.

President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College.

President-Emeritus James A. Burns, University of Notre Dame.

President George D. Olds, Amherst College.

COMMISSION ON PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND METHODS OF RATING:

President Walter Dill Scott, Northwestern University,
Chairman.

Professor W. V. Bingham, Personnel Research Federation.

Professor F. K. Strong, Stanford University.

Director Adam Leroy Jones, Columbia University.
Dean Edgar J. Wiley, Middlebury College.

COMMISSION ON PUBLICATIONS:

President Frank Aydelotte, *Ex-officio*.

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, *Ex-officio*.

President Bernard I. Bell, *Ex-officio*.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Address of the President. JAMES H. KIRKLAND.....	55
The Social and Civic Responsibility and Opportunity of American Colleges and their Graduates. GRAHAM TAYLOR.....	63
Practicalizing the Social Sciences. LUDD M. SPIVEY.....	77
How Shall the College Discharge Its Obligation to Society? J. B. JOHNSTON.....	84
The Place of the Arts in American Education. FREDERICK P. KEPPEL	100
A College Course in Art Appreciation. GEORGE C. NIMMONS.....	106
Franco-American Reciprocity. ROBERT L. KELLY.....	110
Higher Education and World Relations. YUSUKE TSURUMI.....	121
A Department of Education. JOHN H. MACCRACKEN.....	132
Debate—Resolved, That the Sterling Bill, Providing for a De- partment of Education and a Federal Subsidy for Education in the States, Should Become Law.	
<i>Affirmative</i> —GEORGE D. STRAYER.....	141
<i>Negative</i> —CHARLES H. JUDD	153

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

CHANCELLOR JAMES H. KIRKLAND,
Vanderbilt University

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appear before you this evening with some degree of embarrassment. I was elected on one ticket and am now assuming office on another ticket. The committee that nominated me for President was very specific in informing me that the President was not expected to make a speech, and I have a strong feeling that this was the condition on which I was nominated. The Executive Committee, at a later date, feeling that present arrangements ought to be sacrificed for future good, passed a resolution that the President must always have something to say, or must always deliver an opening address.

Something was said two years ago to the effect that at the opening dinner there should always be one joke. I think possibly there are two tonight, one on me and one on you. (Laughter.) I shall, however, do very little more than introduce the speaker of the evening and the subject which will be presented to you by other speakers during the occasion of our meeting.

It is not my habit nor my preference to read papers, and yet the importance of this occasion is such that I hardly know how to protect the speaker on the one side and you on the other from an over-extended program except by confining myself rather rigidly to some written remarks. So I beg your kind indulgence while I try to read what is hardly more than an introduction to the great theme that will be discussed by several speakers during this meeting.

The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing agency as some other similar organizations are, but it is not entirely without its own standards and policy. It enforces reasonable requirements for admission, but its chief task seems to be to unite all its members into a co-

operative work of self-improvement, studying the problems of college life, and seeking a solution wherever possible. This work is carried on consecutively year by year through commissions whose reports form the most important part of our program. We have also supplemented these reports by more general papers and addresses on well chosen themes of commanding interest. Last year these addresses were centered around the topic, "The Place of Religion in Higher Education." For this year we have selected a topic not unrelated to that of last year, for surely a religious life or a religious creed in college ought to be in some way reflected in a life of service outside of college. The thoughts that burn within the college campus must be proven by the power available for work outside the campus. The class in engineering is taught how to construct a dynamo, but the test of that construction is not the beauty of the wire wrappings or polish of the metal plates, but in the power delivered by the finished machine.

In speaking of the social and civic responsibilities of colleges we necessarily open up these institutions to frank criticisms, but criticism of educational institutions is not new. It has been going on for half a century. Students criticise the faculty, and the faculty criticises the students. Both faculty and students criticise administrative officers. Again and again the outside public takes a hand in this discussion and criticises the whole combined educational organization.

There are three points of view from which we may study institutions for higher education. One is as places for study, where teachers and taught meet together in common tasks; where young people acquire some knowledge of the past and the present, of the world in which they live, of the principles underlying mental growth and of the value of intellectual attainments. The importance of this process is not measured by the residuum of accurate information remaining after four years of study. To have learned and to have forgotten is far different from an original state of

primitive ignorance. To bear through life a mind to some extent trained and disciplined, to possess intelligent interest in things worth while, a discriminating judgment between what is good and what is bad in letters or in life, to feel at home in noble association with books or pictures or men, is easily worth four years of life and work. From time immemorial these results have been attained or sought through all manner of culture courses, and through all possible combinations of study. Recent criticism contends that present-day seekers after culture are too often idlers without real purpose, mistaking the incidental things of college life for the main purpose, glorying not in achievement but in escape from labor, and seeking pleasure rather than wisdom.

We shall not this evening stop to argue this point, or to contrast with this type another type of vocational or professional students that is crowding our college halls, and influencing, to some extent, the atmosphere of college life. There are those who contend that these students, influenced as they are largely by life motives, will prove the saving salt of a degenerating society.

Leaving that question, we turn to another point of view from which we may view and judge institutions of learning. It has always been the effort of colleges and universities to fit young men and women for world service. This has been attempted not primarily by knowledge, but by inspiration and character development. Through every generation this duty has been recognized and discharged. It was this sense of public obligation that stripped our colleges of teachers as well as students in the great war, that turned every laboratory into a government workshop, that mobilized every force, intellectual as well as physical, for war service. It is from this standpoint of civic service that colleges are valued and supported by the general public. The alumni records of every institution abound in striking illustrations of lives thus molded for service through college training. These are the men whose names are repeated in college

circles with pride and with honor. Every college president in this audience tonight could furnish striking illustrations out of the records in his own institution of the wonderful results achieved by the consecrated service of men and women. It will be noted that the performances of such persons are unrelated to the technical studies of their college course. Their preparation was of a more subtle nature. Their achievements register the triumph of spirit, of personality, of will, and even of religious fervor.

In a recent address delivered at Columbia University by Professor Robert J. Leonard, of Teachers College, it is pointed out that professional education has much to gain through its immediate connection with university training. Through this contact we hope for professional men who are not mere technicians, but who have absorbed university ideals of culture and service. These men recognize what Professor Leonard aptly calls "marginal responsibilities," which are not technical, but which bear some relation to professional activity. But further than that men so trained are supposed to recognize the common responsibilities, neither technical nor marginal, that belong to every man of generous training and culture.

The same universal obligation of colleges and college men to society is developed in a recent volume by Professor Hudson on "The College and New America." From this volume I quote the following apt sentences: "This new idealism is the biggest thing in education today. The important thing is that there is an unprecedented search for the unacademic and true purpose of the college. . . . The purpose of the college must be coincident with whatever is the supreme moral obligation of the age. It will be a wider and a deeper thing than scholarship on the one hand, or technical efficiency on the other; although it will demand both of these with all its soul."

Is it possible to recognize at this time a supreme moral obligation for our own age? A few years ago it was easy to express the imperative call for universal service in terms

of war. Is it not true that there is a call for the service of peace equally imperative? We have been left with the task of rebuilding a world, of reconstructing the universal social order, of organizing our knowledge for new problems, and inspiring college men and women for new tasks. Under this impulse the social sciences have taken their place at the very heart of the college curriculum. Even the physical sciences, so stimulated by war needs, have had to give way to studies that involve social, political and moral problems. The world of thought is still the world. It is, therefore, very fitting that we give our attention at this meeting to certain able speakers who will present to us different phases of this general topic. Perhaps we need such addresses more than we need papers on technical subjects like admission requirements, or even athletics.

It was my privilege recently to attend the annual meeting of an important educational association. Much of the work of that association was done by committees, and much of it had to do with college standards. One report was made on athletics, and this report was greatly magnified in the daily press. After we had adjourned there was a thoughtful editorial in the leading morning paper of the city where we met protesting against the failure of the conference to touch vital problems. The editor pointed to the fact that the student of today will be the voter and the leader of tomorrow. He asked this question, "Is he getting in college those foundations of culture and right thinking and general knowledge that he must have later on lest he be a failure?" The editorial proceeds as follows—quoting freely: "Young men are failing. They are recruiting the criminal classes. There is a growing disregard for law, a decline in business morals, a break in sex morality. We want to know how youth can be trained so as to reduce the number of these failures. We thought the educators would say something about these things, but they did not say much. The big question was athletics. We doubt if Socrates or Plato could get a professor's chair today unless it was for advertising

purposes. Perhaps Socrates could help coach the football boys, because he was a hefty old fellow." These criticisms are quoted not because they are entirely just, but because they point to the fact that thoughtful men are asking the colleges to meet and solve world problems, and the public is interested, not so much in the technical knowledge imparted to students, as in the character of life exhibited by college men and women.

There is still another aspect from which higher institutions may be studied, and that is as social organisms. Some colleges and universities have a citizenship large enough for a small city. Even small colleges today have 500 students. These students live independent lives. There is but little supervision over what they do or say. They do many things besides study. It will be conceded that these student interests are all important. College years are not only a preparation for life, they are life itself, filled with tragedy and comedy, with work and play, with joy and sorrow, with pleasure and pain. Our consideration of this field is pertinent tonight only because of the relation that exists between it and the two other fields of college life already mentioned. There is necessarily some relation between a boy's study and his life outside the classroom. Scholarly habits, refinement of taste, ambition to excel in worthy pursuits, must be visible if these things exist at all. The honor system is either a dead phrase or it must make for honorable conduct in every phase of life. Selfishness in college will never be the beginning of unselfishness after college life is ended. Leaders of men cannot be made out of students who never lead and who only follow inclinations and impulses of unworthy origin. The mountain heights will not be attained by those whose pathway has been a descending one. The Marathon will not be won by the idler, nor will victory in a football game come to the team that has slept away its hours of training.

The point to which I come is this—does the present trend of student life reflect either intellectual training or higher

moral purposes? If we may judge by the developing product of our own handiwork, are we giving either instruction or inspiration? I do not undertake to answer this question, but the question is a fair one. I note the outspoken criticisms of deans of students and other administrative officers. I note the widespread dissatisfaction with the present status of intercollegiate athletics. I note the criticisms of social life, of dances and automobile parties, criticisms emanating from a dozen reliable sources. I note the literature springing up on every hand and claiming to portray college life as it really is and not as it ought to be. Even if these pictures are exaggerated they contain truth enough to cause the gravest concern. If they are not exaggerated they constitute an indictment against all the intellectual and moral standards of our colleges and universities. Is there a remedy for these things? Certainly not an easy one. The remedy will be found not in repression but in substitution. We must find a new appeal. Our intellectual work must be intensified and must be linked in some vital way with the process of character building. If the social sciences are to continue as the center of our curriculum, there must be found a more definite application of these lessons to the process of living. Students of Economics ought not to be spendthrifts, either of money, or time, or character. Political Science should teach a wise organization in college as well as in states and nations. Ethics should produce honorable and unselfish contacts even in college societies and on the athletic field. Philosophy and Sociology should perfect our ideals of individual life and group responsibility. Surely it is not creditable that there should be a decline in all standards of living at the very time of the ascendancy of social studies. By every token then we read the lesson of large responsibility. Through college studies, through a better organization of college life, and through the inspiration that comes from higher ideals and nobler purposes, we must try to meet the challenge that comes to us from the larger world. If colleges do not provide leaders

for world tasks, where else may they be found? If we do not uphold orderly society, who may be expected so to do? Surely it is our supreme mission to send out men and women dedicated to great purposes and to unselfish service, and surely it is our task to write educational history, not in the records of lost causes and forgotten allegiances, but in the restoration and uplift of a troubled world.

THE SOCIAL AND CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY OF AMERICAN COL- LEGES AND THEIR GRADUATES.

PROFESSOR GRAHAM TAYLOR

During the last half of the nineteenth century at Oxford University, John Ruskin and Thomas Hill Green, from their respective points of view of art and philosophy, laid upon the consciences and the hearts of their students a modern interpretation of the old, old principle of *noblesse oblige*. They interpreted it, however, in terms of common honesty that exacted some return for the investment which present and past generations had made in the education furnished the privileged classes by the higher institutions of learning. Therefore culture is a debt. Its payment back to the community is demanded in common honesty. Forth from their classes there went men to discharge that debt along the levels of economic justice, civic patriotism, social amelioration and religious progress.

Back to the university and its kindred institutions also, came full remuneration for all the expenditure of life and treasure that had gone forth from them to the masses of the people. Down in a South London parish there was a university trained rector working away. Because of his insight into the common life and his daily contact with the masses of his fellow-men, he conceived the idea of a new history, the "Short History of the English People." Another clergyman, the Reverend Samuel A. Barnett, carried back to the cloisters of Oxford the insights and outlook which he had taken among his fellow-men in White Chapel, that city wilderness great and terrible. He became the canon of Bristol, and later the canon of Westminster Abbey, and in those exalted positions became an interpreter of the separated classes of English society, perhaps to a greater extent than any man of his generation.

One of the young graduates who came from Oxford to his assistance, to share something of the culture of the university with the laboring men of East London, produced that remarkable volume, "The Industrial Revolution in England," bearing the name of Arnold Toynbee. In it he gave a new turn to economic thought by insisting that the principle of observation—in other words the scientific method of reasoning back from fact to theory, from the specific to the general—had been given to economic science by the demands of the trade unions of England for a consideration of the cost of living in relation to the rate of wages. After his early death, Canon Barnett established on White Chapel Road the first social settlement, calling it Toynbee Hall—the suggestive forerunner of the University Extension Movement.

Can there be any greater obligation than that we teachers should have a continuous and ever growing consciousness of the debt which our institutions owe to the communities in the midst of which they are planted? Fully aware of this obligation must those of us be who are serving state institutions, whose buildings are built, whose libraries are equipped, whose professors' salaries are paid out of the taxes of the people, that come from the sweat of the farmer and the grime of the mechanic, from those who pay taxes indirectly through the cost of living as truly as from those who are rated high on the tax list. Is there any avoidance of feeling the obligation which every college, whether state supported or supported by voluntary contributions, owes back to the state which exempts it from taxation in order that it may produce the leadership of its citizens?

There was a critic of one of the state universities who thought he was making a point against it by declaring, "Wisconsin not only has a state university but is a university state." No higher compliment could have been paid to an institution located at the capital of a state than that the public officials in the capitol and the professors in the university were alike identified in promoting the progress of that great commonwealth.

If there is any faltering or failure upon the part either of teachers or students to recognize the debt that culture really owes to the community, some of us have had good reason to realize that others among the unprivileged masses are quite conscious of our obligation.

When I first came to Chicago and offered to lend a hand at Hull House, I met a Russian Jewish citizen of this city who in very direct language asked me if I knew I "owed whatever I could do for the great laboring masses of this city." I never had been challenged so before. I hesitated in my answer, but he did not pause. He said, "While we who are as capable as you may be to acquire culture and have perhaps as great a desire to do so, are laboring, we are buying for you the leisure to learn." I never was taught, nor ever once thought that my leisure to learn was more or less at the expense of those whose labor for existence allowed no leisure to learn. Later I found that this man could make good his claim of desiring culture, for he asked me if I could not get him a position as ticket-taker on the elevated railroad to work at night. As he was an expert craftsman, I said, "You want no such monotonous job as that." He said, "Yes I do, I want to work at night, because perhaps from one to three o'clock in the morning I would have a chance I never have had in all my life for consecutive reading."

Shortly after that he asked me if I did not know of some one with whom it would be "worth while to discuss the economic theory of value." I asked him if he had any one in mind. He said, yes, he thought of "challenging the economic department of the University of Chicago to furnish some one."

I immediately betook myself to one of my friends in that department and told him to "have a care." Forthwith there came a memorable challenge and discussion on the free floor of Chicago Commons. The professor's learning of the schools and the workman's experience of life and his mastery of volumes which he never quoted—John Stew-

art Mills's "Political Economy," and Karl Marx "Das Capital"—gave unique interest to the debate.

My son went to Harvard University. He was followed by a letter from a Chicago working boy friend, saying how much he missed him because he loaned him what he called "a hearing ear." But then he drew himself up to full stature to give his friend this reminder: "Do not forget that your education at Harvard is costing a great deal more than you or your father will ever pay for it. Therefore, return in glorious light for all the oil that is being poured into the lamp of your life."

Nothing learned at that university could sink more deeply into the consciousness and conscience of a student than this man to man reminder of the ethic that learning owes something to labor.

Now the importance of the obligation to drill that consciousness and conscience into the minds and hearts of the men and women going forth from our institutions into the varied walks of life can not be estimated, especially at this supreme crisis in American political, social, economic, national and international development. I wish to illustrate that importance by brief references to some insistences upon the discharge of that obligation which open the way to glorious opportunities to the college educated people.

The first insistence is the fact that the democratic state is rapidly and radically extending its functions into the sphere in which the church, and very select groups of people, formerly considered it their prerogative to function. I have only to remind you that public education is comparatively a modern function of the state, laying tremendous tribute upon the educated classes of America to maintain, promote and help guide and operate the most American thing in America, the American public school.

Long before the court-house and parliament buildings loomed larger than the cathedral, the old cathedral gave the refugee from the avenger his only day in court. Under its low arched door and across its well-worn threshold ran

the man pursued by the avenger to lay hold on the horns of the altar, and at the door there stood a priest with a crucifix crying to the avenger, "Sanctuary!" In the race riots in Chicago three years ago, a negro, pursued by a mob of whites, ran for refuge through the open door of a Roman Catholic Church. And a priest stood there at the threshold, as of old, in between him and the howling mob, crying the old cry of "Justice! Sanctuary!", and that mob fell back!

The church and its kindred groups hitherto had the function of caring for the orphan and the widow, the sick and the aged, the stranger and the shelterless, the defective, and the delinquent child. But now the counties and the State of Illinois maintain more dependent people, distribute more charity, care for more sick, shelter the aged for whom there is all too little shelter elsewhere, pension the widow so that she can keep her little children around her and not break up her family circle, keep detention homes and schools open, and research institutes at work for juvenile delinquents, and administer more institutional funds that all their churches and voluntary charities.

Our citizenship being invested with these more delicate, difficult and numerous functions, do we need a less or more educated body politic? Do we need a more or less religious generation to perform these duties to the weak and wayward, afflicted and helpless wards of the State? It is surely up to the colleges to send forth men and women to take their full share in these civic functions, now assumed by a more direct democracy than was ever contemplated by the founders of our representative government. While we take satisfaction in those graduates who have come to distinction through high or humble service, it is very doubtful whether the body of college educated citizens in hardly any community is discharging its full share of responsibility, or making its full return for what the community has invested in their education. A poll was made of the university students living within the city of New York in the McKinley campaign, and the Republican Com-

mittee of the County published a statement that 5,000 university men who had been checked up were not known to take any personal interest or action in the local government of their city, or in the political progress of their country. I am very sure that none of us can make the claim that the university and college clubs, located at the very center of tragic necessity, are beginning to take or exert the civic and social interest that so large and influential a group of educated people might very fairly be expected to offer their community.

Now while this extension of the function of the democratic state has been progressing, there has been an alarming decrease of interest in the discharge of the duties of citizenship. Four years ago, only forty-nine per cent of electorate in the United States actually deposited their ballots for the President of their own country. This year scarcely fifty-two per cent did so. When some of us who are interested in the progress and democratic control of this great city check up who are the slackers, we find them in some of the most American sections of our city and its suburbs. Among them are many of the most intelligent of our native born population. There is an abdication of American citizenship that is inconceivable in view of the spread of our educational institutions and the increasing number in every community who are high school and college graduates.*

And yet the few college educated men and women who have turned their obligation into opportunity are conspicuous examples of the incentive, the motive, the allurements which might be held out to others who are lagging in the discharge of these obligations. When this city had a city council of sixty-eight men, fifty-eight of whom were known to be there in the service of special interests, mostly their own, and ten of them only were suspected of being honest, with good grounds of suspicion, two college men

* See "Non-Voting," by Charles E. Merriam and Harold F. Gosnell, University of Chicago Press.

entered the council as aldermen and gave battle royal to the grafters. They turned the political tide of this great commonwealth by leading the way to organizing the Municipal Voters' League. By pouring the spotlight on the reputations of the men desiring re-election or admission to the city council, the voters were inspired and encouraged to elect better men to represent them. That little group led the way to rally the large membership of the City Club of Chicago, and the Women's City Club. To-day we have the most fearless, independent, law enforcing administration in the whole history of this great city, while the struggle for its support is unremittingly waged in the wards. But oh what a slender battle line rallied for a long while to recruit and reinforce that little group of leaguers, to which I have had the privilege to belong these twenty-eight years! I have seen man after man fall all too early in life, laying life itself upon the altar of civic duty. Difficult it still is, after twenty-eight years of successful campaigning, to line up the intelligence and moral stamina of this city behind any continuous, progressive, steadfast movement to entrench high standards of administration in the municipal and county governments of this fourth greatest city in the world.

Last week a most remarkable series of commemorative meetings were held. The first half of the week was devoted to the commemoration of the founding in Chicago, twenty-five years ago, of the first juvenile court. Men and women in judicial, university and administrative positions, gathered here to credit the juvenile court law of Illinois with making an epoch in the jurisprudence of America and the world, by giving the child a child's own day in court. Up to that time, twenty-five years ago, a child was a child, in so far as his property was concerned, until twenty-one years of age, but so far as his person was concerned, if he or she broke a law there was no recognition of youth. If he or she was declared "guilty," the law had a certain penalty for that guilt, and irrespective of childhood,

whether defective or intelligent, whether of years of discretion or adolescent, the penalty was applied.

Then a Chicago woman had vision to see that perhaps delinquency might be caused by defect, so she contributed \$5,000 a year for five years and gave liberty to a young physician and psychologist, Dr. William Healy, to lay the foundation for the first juvenile psychopathic institute. Established at first as a volunteer agency, it became so absolutely essential to the juvenile court that it was taken over by the county, and now by the state as the Children's Institute of Research. That vision of an educated woman made it possible to lay a new basis of scientifically observed facts for dealing with delinquent children. The psychopathic branch of this court is reproducing itself in the procedure of criminal courts. Behind those two movements there was a small group of educated women in this city, and they turned in this direction the judicial procedure not only of this state but in all except two states in the United States, and in almost every civilized land of the world. A marvelous return was registered at those brilliant meetings, for the investment of intellect, conscience and vision upon the part of that noble band of women citizens of Chicago.

So I might multiply instances of the wonderful growth of the influence of those who have initiative and steadfastness and trained intellect to start, and steady, and support such movements until the experiment becomes a demonstration, and the demonstration is taken over by the city, county or state.

While the electorate has been increasing, there has been an increasing call also for intervention by the trained intelligence of the country in the conflict that divides industry. Too long have I been between its millstones to make light of any effort to bring together those on both sides of this cleavage. However serious the breach may be, it can be bridged, there can be a common denominator found. I have had experience and observation enough so to believe.

And yet, if I were to name groups of my fellow-citizens here who were perhaps the worst examples of the class-conscious conflict spirit, of course I would cite the extreme class-conscious socialists, but I would also have to include some of the select club circles in this city to which I belong. On occasion, I do not find any more violent class-conscious feeling, even for conflict, in the one group than I find in the other.

In one of these clubs some years ago I heard a few employers, with great agitation and vehemence denouncing certain organized employees, when one of them drew me aside and said, "The trouble with those men is that they haven't the education to perceive that what they are embarrassed by is only a little local phase of an age-long and a world-wide conflict." I have found the same thing true of organized labor leaders, few of whom have enough sense of perspective to understand the background of the labor movement itself. Quite as dangerous ignorance is apparent upon the part of employers who know just about as little of the great conflicts of the past.

After the war there came this tremendous reaction which is breeding such dangerous intolerance. The very men who had been sitting around the same table with the same loyalty for the common cause began at once to fall apart on either side of the same old cleavage, and even the forward facing men among them on both sides began to take reactionary attitudes. It is a readily demonstrable fact that the American labor movement is the most conservative in the world, and that the leaders of the American Federation of Labor are the most reactionary of the world's labor leaders. And yet most of our employers regard the trades unions as most rampantly radical in economic and political affairs, notwithstanding the loyalty of American organized labor throughout the entire World War.

Now, thank God, the return to reason is beginning to appear on both sides. Some of the men who were leaning over backwards are standing up straight again and looking

facts more humanly and hopefully in the face. We may be very sure that unless we can somehow or other produce from our colleges and schools men and women with a larger knowledge of the background of economic and industrial history, with an ethical vision truer to group life and the common welfare, and with the spirit to rise above the mere class-conscious self-interest, the cleavage will go from bad to worse. Now to stand in between, to try to understand and interpret, gives us a vivid consciousness of the danger which summons our American college teachers and their students and graduates to the rescue of our country from this perilous situation. Those who have this social intelligence and broadly human spirit are the hope of the age. This I affirm after a life-long study and observation of industrial conditions and relations, with personal acquaintanceships on both sides of the fateful struggle.

Again, there is a demand to bridge the chasm in race relationship. Some of us who live in social settlements realize how much this needs to be done and how very readily it can be done. During the war the very peoples from Southeastern Europe who are now discriminated against by the last immigration law, demonstrated a patriotism that positively put to shame that of many Americans. I was the chairman of a draft board that registered 12,400 of my neighbors, most of them Poles from Austria. When asked, "Do you wish to become a soldier?" many a man replied, "Why no, I left Austria to avoid it, but I go if you need me." "Do you wish to go as an American citizen?" "Surely." "Then go to the city hall and get your first papers."

Many of those men who had a perfectly good alien claim came back and were drafted. Then with blanched face and sometimes a tear in the eye, they would say, "But, my God, sir, I forgot, I may meet my father or my brother in the Austrian trench." So they might. Then the war with Austria came, and the men we took down to Camp Grant were thrown out of their uniforms as "alien ene-

mies," when they protested against being registered as being born in Austria. Then they volunteered at a recruiting station in a little Polish saloon, joined the Polish Legion, united with the armies of France, fought through four years of the World War, and then guarded the Polish frontier from the Bolshevic Russians for seven years more! They are among the men who, we now say, are unworthy of American citizenship, although we let Mexicans in by the thousands, and have no quotas either for South Americans, Porto Ricans and Central Americans. Restricting immigration may be a national right and a temporary necessity, but doing a right thing in a wrong way is at best to blunder badly. After our diplomacy had restricted Japanese immigration to a negligible minimum, was it anything less than a wanton act to slap a friendly nation in the face, to create an enmity that any self-respecting people will find it difficult to condone or forgive, when a little more temperate intelligence, a more considerate procedure might have avoided what may long linger as an embarrassment to the State Department as well as to our local communities.

Somehow or other we must get more groups of real human beings in between the lines of this racial cleavage. I know no group that should be so well qualified to do so than that of those who have enough etymological, ethnological and historical intelligence to be more human than "Nordic," who have acquired some economic and political background for their citizenship and statesmanship.

Once more, there has come about a strange, new cleavage in the religious life and organization of the land. I have heard no more impressive address at the American Sociological Society than that by Professor Elwood, of the University of Missouri, on "Intolerance in America." He drew his instances of intolerance from the economic, the political, the racial and the religious spheres, but he found the most bitter of all intolerance to be that of the religious sects or factions.

I fail to see how we can forever go on with a divided Christianity and a more or less united intolerance in all

spirit be borne aloft by all of us, as at once the symbol and secret of victory. *'In hoc signo vinces'.*"

My fellow teachers, we have no higher obligation or opportunity to serve our own and future generations than to send forth our students with the chivalry of a new knight errantry, to bear the cross of an economic, a social, a political and a religious self-denial, which is the only sign by which this spirit can conquer. To enter the lists our students are challenged by the reactionary attitude of a generation so disillusioned by war as to apologize for having had ideals, to condone the lowering of standards, and to assume a devil-may-care indifference not only toward progress but toward loyalty to law. A public spirited citizen accosted me on the street the other day with the question, "What shall we do with this generation of privileged young fellows who do not seem to know the meaning of citizenship or patriotism?" A man of the University Club yesterday asked, "Could you ever have imagined any such intellectual, moral and spiritual slump as we are now passing through?" If we teachers can imagine it, it should only spur us on, with John Ruskin and Thomas Hill Green, to drill into the hearts, minds and consciences of the educated youth of America, the obligation and the glorious opportunity of bearing aloft the banner of the sacrificial, aspiring, unconquerable spirit—which is simply the goodwill to understand one another, to interpret misunderstood attitudes and situations, to reconcile and be reconciled to differences of taste and temperament, race and religion, heritage and aspiration, and, through service and sacrifice to promote the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

PRACTICALIZING THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEAN LUDD M. SPIVEY,
Birmingham-Southern College

Man has always yearned and struggled to control his world. In his primitive state a modicum of such control was necessary to his very existence, for he was beset on every hand with unfriendly groups, wild beasts, and natural elements which sought his destruction. He therefore lived only as he triumphed over his environment.

In the struggle for the control of the world man has used a multitude of agencies. Magic, exorcism, propitiation and all the outworn elements of primitive religion were at heart the means adopted by early man to control the world in which he found himself. These gave him small success.

It was not until man learned mechanics and discovered that he was able to manipulate his physical environment that the world really came under his sway. It has been a long process. The method has been that of trial and error. But man has in a large measure succeeded and has at last gained all but complete physical mastery of his world. The record of his achievements in this field of endeavor is familiar and remarkable; when we reflect upon it we must be amazed at the things man can do with the material world.

But while man has been subduing the world of matter a new world has been growing up around him—the world of society. It is a world which his primitive forbears did not know, and to which even modern man, so intent on mastering matter, has given but small consideration. Now we are awaking to the fact that our social environment is quite as important as our physical environment. We have not mastered it. Indeed, multiplied millions of our fellow-men are being mastered by it, are at its mercy just as primitive man was at the mercy of the elements. And so the struggle must begin anew. We must secure social control even as we have already secured physical control.

It must be apparent to all that our social mastery has by no means kept pace with our mechanical mastery. Prophets are not wanting to tell us this. "Our things outrank the use we make of them." Farseeing men are coming to realize that one of our primary duties in the further development of civilization is to bring about social control, to bend to the higher uses of the race all the influences and activities of the social order. Unless we do this we are certain to discover that our knowledge of the physical sciences and our control of the material world will prove a menace rather than a blessing.

We accordingly find a growing interest in the social sciences on the part of the forward-looking persons and the curricula in our schools are being adjusted to meet the increasing demand for sociology, economics, political science and similar studies. This is certainly a hopeful indication and is not infrequently pointed to as proof that we are growing in social-mindedness. On the other hand, there are those who tell us that there is less social-mindedness in our colleges today than ever before and that our college men and women are less interested in social welfare than the students of old.

Without pausing to discuss these matters, we may admit that there is a great need to link up the teaching of the social sciences with life. It is true that many students obtain a good theoretical knowledge of social problems and then go out to live unsocial or antisocial lives. One may have an exact knowledge of the principles of economics, for example, without having the slightest interest in creating a better economic system for the welfare of the group. We must find a way to make abstract learning become controlling conviction. We must so impart social facts that an active concern for the social order will be aroused in the student.

We can scarcely formulate in these remarks a definite and infallible program by means of which this may be done, but we should at least be able to suggest some lines which

such a program should follow. We shall first of all have to surmount certain difficulties.

In the first place we face the difficulty that we are still living in an individualistic world, and this in spite of our professions to the contrary. Our text-books tell us that we cannot live apart from one another, yet we commonly act as if we could. Our home and business training, all the face-to-face groups with which we come in contact, tend to ground us in the *laissez faire* doctrine of 'every man for himself.' All this has been drilled into the student before he comes to our classrooms, and thus it is that our social teachings have only a theoretical interest for him. The soil is already preoccupied.

This means that the first step in making these sciences practical must be taken long before the student ever hears of a college. In the home, in the Sunday School, in the grades, everywhere through life the process of social instruction should be carried. Until we can change the curriculum of experience and observation we will have difficulty in profoundly influencing the minds of our students.

A second difficulty is found in the fact that the students still frequently regard their college life as something apart from real life, and thus the value of what our theorists call "expressional activity" is denied us. How can a student express life-truths in an environment and activity which he does not regard as life?

Have we not all been impressed with the apparent spirit of irresponsibility which prevails among a large section of our student population? And is this not traceable, in some measure at least, to the fact that the men do not feel themselves to be in the midst of the serious affairs of life? They think that they will have no practical use for what they learn until they get back to their communities and into the business world, and the natural result is that the deeper influences we succeed in setting a-going in their lives have slipped away from them before that time comes. A surprising number of students behave in an anti-social way on the

campus, and even in the classroom where the social sciences are being taught, believing that their conduct there does not count as life. We have a great and pressing need for a spirit among our students which will transform college life into a social laboratory wherein they consciously act out in real life the principles which they daily learn in their lessons.

In the third place, our own attitude toward the student not infrequently tends to widen the gulf that separates him from real life. Our system of standards, requirements, credits and grades must often impress him as being mechanical and far removed from the actual requirements of his own personality. We apply our measuring-rod to the freshman, fit him into the category prepared for all such, classify him without even looking him squarely in the face, without stopping to reflect that here is a human being, with a personality, a soul and a destiny. So he drops into the routine. He strives not for truth but for grades, not to make of himself a social being but to amass the required number of hours.

Then we distrust the student and are not at pains to conceal the fact from him. We expose him to learning but he knows we would not heed his advice. We give him all the facts we have, but he has no actual and vital participation in government, business or society. We have never worked out a scheme whereby the young may apply what they know before they are twenty-one or before they must make a living for themselves.

All of this, as I have said, tends to still further separate the student from life, to prevent the "expressional activity" through which education becomes real, and to deepen the impression that the things being taught in the college are not really to be used in the work-a-day world.

A fourth difficulty, which is indeed akin to some of those already mentioned, lies in the fact that the young people do not grasp the idea that they live in a moving, progressing and forming world. Instead of instinctively under-

standing that tomorrow is yet to be made and that on him is the task of making it, the average young man instinctively understands that tomorrow is already made and must not be disturbed. He has been taught to measure success in temporal terms, and all the successful men he knows are exponents of the *status quo*.

This attitude of mind has been cultivated in him before he ever comes to us. It will be still more deeply ingrained in him after he leaves us. Our teaching is thus a thin layer of abstraction between the upper and nether millstones of stern reality. Is it, then, any wonder that our students are content to leave the social principles in the realm of theory and regard them as appealing ideals, but wholly unusable in actual practice? We greatly need a method by which the student can be made to see that the world in which he is to live will be the world he makes and that his learning is to make him free to find wrong anywhere, to criticise and amend it wherever he finds it. He must feel that he is free to discover, criticise, rebuke, advise, and that his judgment will be given a fair hearing.

Now coming around at last to my subject, I remark that in order to make the social sciences practical we must first overcome the difficulties I have mentioned. Some of them are beyond our reach as teachers; they lie in the home, the elementary school and the general social order, all of which must change in method and attitude before our task becomes easy.

Let us recall and apply in the teaching of the social sciences the elementary principle of education, namely, that instruction should connect its subject matter with the experience of the student. Unfortunately, our text-books do not always do this. In chapter one, we are usually told what society is; we begin with a definition, and the student frequently learns the definition glibly without ever suspecting that he is a member of society and has always been so. He has been a member of a family and knows it. He understands the duties and responsibilities of home life. If, then,

he began his wider studies at this point of experience and learned that the community, city, state, nation and world are all variations and enlargements of the family, he would obtain a more practical initiation to the social sciences and our task would be much simplified.

It will be of assistance to interpret social experience in terms of personal experience. The youth knows that he did not come into the world with a full mental and moral equipment. He knows that his equipment was acquired socially and not biologically. He is aware, or can easily be made so, that his attitude toward and relation to any religious sect, for example, is the result of his actual contact with people. The same is true of his ideas, ideals, antipathies, sympathies and ambitions. From these facts of his own experience he can easily pass to a proper conception of and a right relation to the social order. As he himself is a product of social heredity, so must the world be. He will learn then that not the production of a better stock, but the making of a better social order is the proper method of progress and redemption.

But unfortunately it is not enough *to know*. One may be aware of his dependence upon the life of the group and yet be guided by social attitudes which are detrimental to both himself and his group. This means that there must be developed along with his knowledge of the group a social responsibility. He must be taught to understand that he will be called upon voluntarily to modify and sometimes to change entirely his social behavior for the welfare of the group. If a crime is committed in his community or some individual suffers a social injustice, the student should be made to feel that he is personally concerned, and should ask himself, "To what extent am I as a member of this group to blame for this particular situation." He will be taught that it will be his duty to search his own inner life to determine if his acts and behavior are in any way encouraging others to live anti-social lives, and at the same time he will ask himself if there is anything which he can

do to prevent such social behavior in the future. *In fine*, he can be shown through the study of his own group life that there is not only something he can do, but there is something which he should and must do if he is to remain loyal to his community. This sense of social responsibility can never be aroused in our college students unless we can find a way to produce in them a sense of guilt whenever they violate or fail to live up to the social standards which are accepted by society.

Even though we are able to make the college student feel a sense of social obligation he may be far from being socialized. He may feel an urge to do something for his group, and he may be really successful in securing a change of attitude on the part of his fellowman. He may become a successful social leader. But, does he lead them in the right direction? Does he know what is socially good? If we are to direct all our behavior toward the good of the group, we must know what is good for the group. A large per cent. of those who are seeking to produce social attitudes and direct the various social groups have no definite idea what is worth while for the group. They are blind leaders of the blind. It is as necessary to teach social goals as it is to teach social methods.

In conclusion, we shall practicalize the social sciences when we so teach college students that they in turn will become unselfishly concerned not with themselves, not with the material world, but loyally devoted to those principles which make a social order that will offer justice to all, mercy to the unfortunate and goodwill to all men.

HOW SHALL THE COLLEGE DISCHARGE ITS OBLIGATION TO SOCIETY?

DEAN J. B. JOHNSTON,
The University of Minnesota

In discussing the obligation of the college to society it is important at the outset to consider the conditions under which the college at present does its work.

Between the years 1900 and 1923 the number of collegiate and technological students in the country increased from 93,000 to 370,000. A period of more rapid growth began about 1911 or 1912 and after the interruption by the war has continued to the present.

Between 1900 and 1910 the population of the country increased 21 per cent., while the collegiate enrollment increased in the south 34 per cent., in the north and west 109 per cent. and in the country as a whole 85 per cent. From 1910 to 1920, while the population increased 14.9 per cent., collegiate enrollment increased in the south 80 per cent., in the north and west 100 per cent. and in the United States 96 per cent. Collegiate enrollment therefore has increased in the last two decades from four times to six and one-half times as fast as the population.

For each million of the population in 1900 there were 1,224 collegiate students, in 1910 there were 1,900 students and in 1920 there were 3,236 collegiate students. In the present year there are nearly three times as many collegiate students for each million of the population as there were in 1900. In some places the relative rate of increase has been still higher. Since 1920 the state University of Minnesota has had two and one-half times as many collegiate students and three times as many college freshmen per unit of the population as it had ten years earlier.

The economic situation arising from these attendance ratios is bound to exercise a powerful influence on the further development of higher education. The increase in

attendance having outstripped the growth of population tends also to outstrip the growth of wealth. As this condition approaches, education must compete with luxuries, social pleasures and individual preferment for the funds necessary to support its institutions. I am well aware of the self-assuring argument of some educators that so long as the country is spending so many millions on mere pleasures and luxuries there is adequate money available for education, but I am not wholly convinced by this argument. Rather the situation is this: if chewing gum, the movies, automobiles, tobacco and home-made brew have a stronger appeal to the people than education, then necessarily with the further increase of students the type of higher education must be cheapened and its standards lowered. The people hold the scales and will weigh education over against their luxuries.

On the other hand, as the proportion of the population going to college becomes larger the competition will become stronger in those professions and occupations which require college training and offer coveted rewards for it. The effect of this will be to slow down the increase in attendance.

Already we see both these tendencies at work and our college attendance constantly approaches a level determined by the opposing action of these two forces. Such being the case the chief concern of society and of the college alike should be to see that those young people who do receive the training of the college are as nearly as possible those who will make the greatest use of that training in the form of service to society.* This is the key to the whole discussion in the present paper.

* Lest I be misunderstood in my use of that word *service* let me say that I do not attach any mystical, religious, evangelical or one-sided altruistic significance to the word. When I speak of service to society I mean just plain coordination in social efforts and co-operation with other social agents, with the same regard for the public welfare that we have for our own interests.

Some persons have said that with the larger proportion of the population coming to us as students the colleges are sampling lower and lower levels of intelligence and therefore have constantly increasing difficulties in performing their functions. I do not know any specific evidence to establish or to disprove this statement. I doubt whether twenty years or even ten years ago there were any data collected or measurements made of a sufficiently accurate kind to serve as a basis for judgment on this question. We do know some things, however, regarding the qualities of our present students which help us to understand the conditions of college teaching and the character of service which the college is expected to render.

In the college with which I am connected about 30 per cent. of the matriculants leave the college with records which show that they lacked the native ability to do the work expected of them. Within four years about 28 per cent. leave college with records that are satisfactory, 24 per cent. take a degree or complete four years of some continuation course and 18 per cent. are still in residence although retarded in progress. Some of those with satisfactory standing return to complete their course later. Eventually about 50 or 52 per cent. of the matriculants in liberal arts complete a course in some college of the university.

The ability of a student to do college work is shown fairly well by his relative standing in his high school class. It would be extremely interesting to have accurate data representative of the country at large to show what voluntary selection takes place between high school and college. I can not give a detailed report for my own institution but it appears that the students who come to us from the high schools of Minneapolis and St. Paul are selected to a slight degree from the upper levels of the graduating classes. The majority of the upper levels of the high school classes are girls, the majority of the lower levels are boys. There is evidence of a little more selection among the boys than

among the girls. The common sense expectation of the ordinary man would be that the people who go to college would be those who have done good work in the high school, but this is not borne out by the students themselves.

The work of the college is influenced more by the attitudes of mind of the students and their parents than by any other one factor except native intellectual ability. It has often been said that many students come to college because it is the thing to do. These students consider college life and a college degree as the means of social and business preferment, in a purely individual and selfish way without any thought of their relations or responsibilities in society, or of their owing anything to society which pays the cost of their education. Some students come to college without any plans regarding their future work and others come with very erroneous choices of vocations. Perhaps most of our students consciously or tacitly make the assumption that all are equally entitled to higher education. A part of the mental attitude of too many of our students is the assumption that any one can do any thing. There is a noticeable tendency to assume that the student himself should be the judge as to what constitutes a proper education. Finally, in so far as our students are young and immature they naturally are unable to judge of their own abilities, to criticize their own motives and efforts, or in an unprejudiced manner to weigh their achievements over against the requirements for success in their chosen vocation.

While these things are true it must not be overlooked that the large body of our students come to us with intellectual ability and moral worth and the clear-cut determination to make good use of the opportunities which the college offers them.

As to the attitude of mind of the parents two things are outstanding. The first is a belief in their own children; the second is a desire to have their children enjoy the opportunities and satisfactions in life which have been denied

to themselves. Both of these are admirable and normal attitudes for parents. We can not quarrel with their ambitions for their children; we can question only their knowledge and their judgment as to what constitutes the greatest satisfaction and happiness for their children and how they are to attain it.

It is surprising to find in how many cases the parents are ignorant as to their children's ability, as to their industry and serious effort in the high school, or as to their relative standing in the high school class. They know no reason to doubt the ability of their children to go through college. Their ignorance of the essential facts in the situation is complete.

The parents who are not college graduates and some of them who are, have very little appreciation of what is to be the peculiar contribution of the college to the future success and happiness of their children. The college is an instrument for the development of moral and intellectual powers already present in the student by reason of the operation of the laws of heredity. Parents do not appear to understand this, but usually assume that their children do possess adequate intellectual powers. Very seldom do the parents of a dull student appreciate the fact that continued success in studies and growth in intellectual power presuppose a peculiar type of personality.

Parental attitudes which are antagonistic to good college work are not limited to ignorant parents or to parents of dull students. Those parents who regard the college as a finishing school, who think that the chief object of college life is to get experience in the ways of the drawing-room and ball-room together with bits of information with which to adorn conversation, those who think that the chief good in college is to make a fraternity and an athletic team, and those who hold a place in the business ready for their sons when they have achieved these purposes present much the greater problem. It is such parents who deprive society of the rightful returns from the investment of funds and con-

fidence which has been made in higher institutions of learning.

Although there are many parents whose attitudes of mind are a source of anxiety to the college, the teacher and administrator will not forget the rank and file of silent, faithful fathers and mothers who watch with intense interest the achievements of their children, who are quick to learn the lessons of effort, of perseverance and of determination which they must share with their children if they are to attain the coveted goal. And let us never forget that some parents promptly recognize the inexorable law that native endowment and aptitude are necessary to achievement and that high native endowment carries with it high duties.

I have not forgotten that I have been asked to speak on the obligation of the college to society. Thus far I have tried to indicate some of the important features in the conditions under which the college must work. The remaining time being short I shall beg your permission to state somewhat dogmatically the services which I think the college should render.

First. The college should introduce to the public mind the principle that to grasp the finest opportunities and secure the highest satisfactions in life the individual must develop, train and put to work the particular native powers or talents which he may possess. One whose chief endowment consists in musical or artistic talent will not attain great success in the practice of law or medicine. One whose chief endowment lies in physical strength will not secure the highest satisfaction by training himself for a career in scholarship or teaching. Nor will the field of scholarship render the greatest rewards to one whose chief talent is for dealing with men, leading and controlling their activities.

The college should make every effort to convey to high school pupils and the general public certain ideas, namely: that the college is a place for people who have the fitness to do certain kinds of things that are done in college and in the professions and occupations for which the college

trains; that there are other kinds of things worth while and honorable and satisfying for those who do not have the peculiar kind of ability that is required for college work; and that every parent who sends to college a child who is not by nature qualified for college work only wastes his own money and his child's time and courts discouragement for his son or daughter which may make difficult success and happiness in any field. In a successful democracy the citizens understand the necessity for division of labor, the inevitable selection of servants for specific functions on the basis of specific fitness for the services required, and the dependence of satisfaction and happiness of the individual upon his finding the work for which his native powers best fit him. The erroneous conception of an intellectual artisocracy must be converted into the conception of division of labor, of selection by society on the basis of fitness, and of service demanded by democracy in proportion to native ability.

These are the ideals which must govern the colleges in their service to society and if society is to get the greatest return from its colleges these principles must become part of the common stock of ideas and must have the general support of public opinion. Entrance to a higher institution of learning is a right only to those who can render society a service which requires the training given by such an institution. Continuance in and graduation from such an institution is a right only to those who use their time and the facilities of the institution to develop their powers and to increase to the utmost their equipment for public service.

Second. Measurement, selection and guidance. The college should perfect methods of educational measurement such as to show why students fail in college, what students are likely to fail and which ones have the endowment necessary for distinguished achievement, and as far as possible what differences of personality are related to various professions or vocations. The increasing ratio between college

students and population means keener competition in the most desirable professions, crowding in all vocations which require college training and greater need for the individual student to find his place in society. Methods of measurement are already so reliable that those colleges which do not set up entrance requirements above graduation from high school, are morally bound to advise those students who do not appear to possess the native endowment necessary for satisfactory college work.

The college should actively and in a practical manner select and classify its students and advise them in the choice of their vocations and in the means of training themselves for efficient work. It is the duty of the college to develop in its students powers of self-judgment which will enable them to cooperate with the college faculty in finding their proper places in society. Although scientific vocational guidance is still in its infancy, it is incumbent upon the college as the agent of society to study carefully the means of vocational advice and give its students the very best service possible in this field.

The number of students who start to college without possessing the natural fitness for the work which the college does is far greater than it ought to be in any well ordered educational system. One can readily understand how a boy might try farming or mercantile pursuits, or insurance or politics and find by experience that he was not fitted for that particular occupation. But in a system whose business is education, in an organized system of schools arranged in orderly sequence from kindergarten to university, what excuse is there for a boy who has finished one grade not knowing whether he can in all probability do the work of the next grade? Or, having finished the grades or the high school, why should he be left in doubt whether he will find the best future and best opportunities *for him* in further education along academic lines or in training in trade or occupational lines or in apprenticeship in business? I ask, why should he be left in ignorance? I agree with you that

most of us do not know enough to advise between these three possibilities in all cases. But is it not our business to know? What are we in the educational game for if we do not know how to articulate the successive grades of our educational system so that young people shall not suffer from educational accident in passing from one grade to the next?

I have not the mortality figures for various colleges. I would not suggest that they are as high for your colleges as they are for mine. But I will venture the guess that they are much higher than you wish. All students who drop out because of intellectual disability are educational misplacements or mal-adjustments. The responsibility for them lies at the door of the educational system together with the social and political system of our time. The schools exist and are supported by the taxpayers for the general welfare. They are social instruments and institutions. They serve social ends. Their efficiency and their excellences are social assets. Their failures and misfits and misdirections are social liabilities.

Third. It is the duty of the college to develop new lines of work designed to adapt the college to the various types of students who deserve some training beyond the high school. First of all there should be a change in the type of our freshman instruction. Most of our teaching for freshmen has been highly departmentalized, highly technical and designed especially to introduce the student to advanced studies in the field of the department. The moment we get our eyes on a freshman we begin to train him for the ideal that is in our own minds. In our day in large universities we begin at once to make a graduate student of him. In my day in a small college they began at once to make a preacher of me. But I was not fitted for the ministry, and many of our students are not fitted either for the vocations of their own choice or for the kind of work which we lay out for them. Freshman instruction should be general, not circumscribed by departmental lines, not narrowly and specifically preparatory to the technical

work of future scholars. Broad surveys of fields of knowledge and teaching which are stimulating, which arouse interest and a spirit of inquiry and which leave the world an inviting and alluring field for study and intellectual adventure—this is the kind of instruction which is suited to the mind and the stage of development of the freshman. And such courses are probably better preparatory to the work of the future scholar because they are stimulating and are not narrowly technical.

For those students who are not intellectually fitted to advance to the higher levels of scholarship such survey courses may not be inappropriate. The needs of these students, however, demand still another sort of instruction. They are worthy of training above the high school level, but they are destined to enter some of the ordinary occupations of life, either in their own home communities or in other similar communities of our states. The learned professions, scholarship and teaching above the public schools are not for them. Yet our college teaching is all intended for persons who are preparing for one of these vocations.

The students of whom I am speaking include twenty per cent. of our matriculants who drop out with satisfactory records and an additional ten to twenty per cent. who eventually graduate with barely passing marks. We need to offer general informational courses of study which shall be of the greatest use to young people of this type in the ordinary walks of life and other courses of training which shall be definitely occupational in character. And finally we should arrange groups or sequences of courses extending through one or two years of time, the completion of which would definitely shape the outlook of the student with regard to the economic problems of his community, the business relations in which he may find himself, the health of his community or the social values and responsibilities of the occupation which he may choose.

To put the matter in another form, these students who deserve some training beyond the high school but are not

fitted for higher scholarship now comprise the largest body of young men and women who will have some college training and they offer to the college its largest opportunity to mould the future citizenship of this country, to train leaders of thought in the ordinary walks of life and to determine the course of social and political movements, that they may be fine and clean and wholesome and socialized and forward looking and not sordid and mean and selfish and socially destructive. The junior college years offer the college its largest opportunity. These years are not simply preparatory to the upper class work and devoid of honor on their own account, but are indeed heavy with their own possibilities.

It is one of the chief duties incumbent on our college faculties today to find means of interesting students of moderate ability in such courses of study and of inducing them to give up the advanced, specialized and technical courses which are intended to complete the training of candidates for the bachelor of arts degree. This should be done, first, for the good of these students themselves because it is the kind of thing for which they are fitted; second, for the advantage of society which will profit by their services; and, third, for the improvement of the conditions in which the superior students are trained. One of the most serious problems within our colleges is the increasing crowding of classes which are intended for intensive study. Courses of study which ten years ago had ten to fifteen students and gave good opportunity for discussion, individual reports and expression of opinion are now attended by forty, fifty or sixty students. Intensive study and pro-seminar methods are impossible with such numbers and to an increasing extent the advanced training which we should give to our students in their last two years is being choked out by the numbers of students who are incapable of receiving or profiting by such training. Our seniors are being given sophomore instruction. Superior students are being deprived of appropriate training because we do not provide appropriate instruction for those of lower ability.

Concretely my suggestion is that the college should by its methods of measurement single out these students of very moderate scholastic ability, advise them regarding their prospects, provide suitable types of instruction for them, and offer a certificate of graduation from the Junior College in recognition of satisfactory work in studies appropriate for them.

Fourth. The college should further develop and improve the methods of training superior students and methods of stimulating them to their best efforts. We do not now command the best efforts of superior students and consequently do not develop their full powers. It is the duty of the college to devote senior college instruction to true advanced and intensive studies appropriate to the ability of superior students and to require the student to organize, articulate and unify his whole course. Our plan of instruction by short specific "courses," each of which is closed by a final examination, has developed in our students a most unfortunate habit of mind, a habit which is at once unscholarly and unfavorable to mastery of any kind. The student is required to take certain courses and regards it as his privilege to finish and forget them. To examine a class in the subject-matter of a prerequisite course is already contrary to the unwritten constitution and to examine them during the second half of the term on subject-matter already covered by an earlier quiz is considered unfair and inconsiderate. Students who have once "passed" a subject or even a part of a course have relieved themselves of all responsibility. If the college will discharge its obligations to society it must take the most strenuous measures to combat this tendency to irresponsibility and this practice of intellectual vagabondage. For the hand-to-mouth existence of our students must be substituted the vision, the marshalling of forces and the concentration of effort upon a distant end which characterize both the scholar and the successful man of affairs. After the foundation work in the junior college the student should direct all his energies toward the attainment of some worthwhile goal as the end of his college

course. This would ordinarily be the mastery of present knowledge in some well defined field supported by a fair acquaintance with related or contributing fields. Instead of having so many major, minor and elective courses to reel out, clip off, check up and forget, the student should have *one job* laid out before him, to be accomplished by his own efforts directed by his own foresight in an organized campaign, and no student should be graduated who does not show himself master of such a situation.

Among methods which may be used to test the students' ability to carry out such a program two may be mentioned. The first is independent study. A considerable part of the work should be done by reading or other study independent of "course work." The second is the comprehensive examination which should precede the awarding of the degree. This examination should regard the work of the college course as a *whole*; it should not be a test of memory or of the power to reproduce the content of courses; it should be a test of assimilation, of culture, and of the power to use acquired knowledge in discussing debated questions, in solving problems or in elucidating principles. The whole of the student's senior college work should be focused upon this demonstration of his initiative and enterprise, his intellectual ability and his moral stamina in carrying through his undergraduate education. His comprehensive examination should be regarded by him as the culmination of an enterprise and should be regarded by his professors as the demonstration of mastery—on the appropriate level. To serve this function the examination must not be too stereotyped. It can not always be conducted in an office or around a seminar table. It must not refer solely to books. It may be conducted in part or wholly in the laboratory or field, in a local charities organization, in a juvenile court, in a public address, in the reading of a memorial ode, or in the presentation of a symphony. The faculty must be satisfied that largely self-directed effort with a scholarly spirit has led the student to the mastery of a field in which he

can be a leader in services useful to society. Of course, I employ the word useful in the widest and most liberal sense.

Considering the greatly increasing proportion of the population who are now going to college there is no reason why the senior college work should be taken by any but superior students. Superior students under proper guidance and stimulus could accomplish vastly more than is now expected for the B.A. degree. The gain would show in the more complete development of the powers of the superior student and the greater efficiency of the graduate, whether he elects to continue on a career of scholarship or to enter practical affairs. I have said so much on this subject because I believe there is an extremely serious shortcoming in our colleges at this point and a situation which is growing steadily worse. The college and the social influences under which it works are to blame for a poor, low, mean, unenviable result of our college course. Our graduates do not do honor to the native talents which our gifted freshmen bring to us.

The college should make the chief criterion of successful college work the improvement, cultivation, development of the native talents of the individual, whatever they may be. I mean to lay stress on the development of individuality, but I mean to lay stress much more on the *development* of the student's talents, to a full realization of his powers. Along with the too great departmentalizing of instruction and the division of instruction into short courses which the student may take and forget, the third great sin of the colleges is the satisfaction of the faculty with the meeting of minimum standards on the part of the students. However these minimum standards are expressed, in every college the capable student who does excellent work, the brilliant loafer who gets by with the passing mark, and the slow and dull student who makes the same mark by perseverance and infinite effort all receive the same diploma. It is of little moment that the excellent student has a *cum laude* attached to his degree. The loss to society comes in the fact that the intellectual powers of the brilliant chap

who bluffs his way through college suffer actual deterioration during his college course. I need not remind you of what happens to the qualities of moral courage, of stamina, of the right forms of enterprise and initiative, of perseverance and hard work and many other personal qualities which society demands for its service. In so far as the college is a loafing place for brilliant youth it is a detriment to society. In its seeking after the perfect curriculum and devising methods of student discipline let the college find a means of stimulating each student to make the most of his talents, to do as good work as he can, to develop and improve his powers while in college. If senior college requirements were worked out along the lines before suggested neither the brilliant loafer nor the plodder could go beyond the junior college. On the other hand, such opportunities put before him might induce the brilliant chap to quit his bluffing and go to work.

Fifth. The college should use every means to gain the sympathy and cooperation of the high school authorities in its program. Report is current that high schools eliminate few students and that this is due to the compulsory education law which requires students to be in school until a certain age. Assuming the wisdom of this law, let us raise the question what kind of a school should the child attend? Should not the public schools distinguish between those who can profit by studies and those who are fitted for trade work or labor? Why keep all the youth in academic high schools through the compulsory school age when many of them would learn more of use to themselves and be trained for much better service to society by doing work of other kinds? And why, above all, should pupils who have reached their scholastic limits be given high school diplomas and sent on to college to be sifted out?

These are in large part questions for the public to answer rather than the authorities of the high schools. But it is the duty of the school authorities to educate the public in these matters.

In support of the belief that high school students differ greatly in the ability to do scholastic work and that the less able ones should be directed away from college, two facts may be cited. The first is the recent demonstration of the lower intellectual ability of children in industries who are pupils in continuation schools as compared with pupils of the same age in the same communities who remain in the regular high schools. The second is the failure of 30 per cent. of those graduates of academic high schools who attempt college work.

At the present time, of course, the expansion of vocational training and the development of technical and trade high schools is bringing about the differentiation which the situation demands and is directing many high school pupils into occupational education who might otherwise join the procession to the college gates.

Sixth. If it be true, as I believe, that there are larger numbers of boys and girls of first rate intellectual ability who graduate from high school but do not go to college, the college should find some means of drawing these capable young people to it. We should plan and work unceasingly to get into the colleges all the best fitted of the high school graduates. Cooperation with the high schools and mutual efforts to educate the public should both contribute to this end. Society ought not to send *more* students to college until it finds a way to send its most gifted youth to college.

Thus let me end as I began with a reference to the part to be taken by the general community and by public opinion in matters of higher education. It is true, the college can not fulfil its obligations to society without selecting and sorting its students, giving them advice and providing instruction adapted to the various types of students and designed to contribute to their various objectives; but neither can it meet its obligations without making direct efforts to educate the public regarding the services which the college can render, the qualifications in students necessary to profit by college training, and the necessity for the functions of the college to be conceived of as a social service, which the general public most of all has need to learn and understand.

THE PLACE OF THE ARTS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

PRESIDENT FREDERICK P. KEPPEL,
The Carnegie Corporation

No matter what the title of my address may be on the program, what I am going to talk about is not *the* place of the Arts in American Education, but *a* place, and I maintain that today the Arts have not such a thing as a place despite all the good isolated bits of work that are done here and there, in music particularly, and in the other arts as well. So far as the colleges are concerned, the figures shown in the recent report on the Fine Arts in Association Colleges prepared for your Association are quite extraordinary. I will simply point out that anybody can show striking percentage results when one starts from zero, and zero about represents the situation ten years ago. I was a college dean in those days and know that no such report could have been made, nor would it indeed have occurred to anybody to try to make it.

We have also made a study of the situation ourselves in the Carnegie Corporation as it affects not merely education in the Fine Arts, but their whole place in our national life, and in this larger field the situation is the same, *i.e.*, ground for encouragement and hope, but no ground whatever for satisfaction. By the way, this study of ours has been printed, and I should be very glad to see that copies of it are sent to any of you who would like to have it, and will let us know of your desire.

In what I have to say today, I shall deal particularly with the American college, because it is that part of American education which particularly interests both you and me; and also because as we college people are so frequently told when we are called upon to cure some particular one of our national failings, the college points both ways—onward into community life and downward into school life.

I think they might sometimes add it's also worth while in and of itself, as a very substantial part of life.

To begin with, let me say that I hope you won't think I am ignorant of the difficulties in the way of providing a more generous place for the Arts in our colleges, or that I am overlooking them. I know that the curriculum is overcrowded already; I know how hard it is to make an art course that is not an unprofitable "snap"; (there are profitable snaps also, but that is another story). I know the shortage of teaching material and, even more dreadful, the shortage of competent teachers. To remedy this alone will require a whole campaign of training. I know how much easier it is to teach the arts separately than to teach their unity, and it is this unity which we must emphasize. I know also what a pedagogical revolution it will mean for our colleges to find means of testing for capacity and promise those students to whom the dominant appeal is through the sensibilities and emotions rather than through the intellect. At present we have what practically amounts to a reverse selection. Those who would be the natural leaders in the artistic life of the college community are not often encouraged to enter it. Your own report, for example, shows the negligible number of our national academicians who ever saw the inside of an American college.

After all, there is nothing fundamentally new in the present situation. Forty years ago it was the natural sciences that were knocking at the doors of our colleges, and twenty years ago what are irreverently called the unnatural sciences. Since then there have been raids by various vocational activities, some of which, alas, have been all too successful. We can skip them, however, as not being fundamental, but I don't think we can skip the Fine Arts. The one thing that is new in this situation is that since the last fundamental change in the college curriculum—that which opened the door to the social sciences—we have learned a great deal in the field of educational measurement and educational appraisal, and we shall be sinning against

the light if we don't apply what we now know in such a way as to avoid the mistakes of omission and commission, and the resulting misunderstandings and bitternesses which accompanied the two earlier realignments of which I have spoken.

Don't let us ever forget what it is all for—not an end in itself, not from the point of view of the student a new system of point credits toward a degree, not from the point of view of the faculty a new cross word curriculum puzzle, and I use each word advisedly, but a function of worthwhile living to enrich and inspire college life and to continue its influence thereafter.

One of our worst mistakes in the past has, in my judgment, been a psychological one, the divorce of appreciation from performance and production. Colleges that have conservatories of music or art schools were rather looked down on and were a bit ashamed of it themselves. Perhaps there was excellent justice for this feeling on the basis of the particular school maintained, but there should be none in having one in itself. Now I don't mean that many great producers or even great performers are likely to come out of our colleges—certainly not unless we can get a new attitude of mind in the matter of admissions. We must always work primarily for an appreciation of the arts, but we are working against the facts of human nature when we fail to give the student whom we are trying to interest the chance to try his own hand, and I venture to promise that if we did this, the results, I mean as to quality of performance, would be very much better than we might think offhand. Let's look back a little. Twenty-five years ago all women and most men would have scouted the idea that they had either desire or capacity for practical mechanical engineering. The development of the automobile has shown them otherwise. Five years ago we would all have said the same of physics in its higher reaches, and today the radio is disproving that. In other words, if in the mysterious and inexplicable ways which so effectively determine human

behavior it becomes "the thing to do," an astonishingly large number of us can find a pretty respectable way to do it. Those who have thus tried their hand will be far more likely to carry out into the world a love of the arts which will continue to enrich their lives even if that love is only one of appreciation. But many of them will continue to perform. Outside the colleges they will find many examples of participation in the arts—community singing organizations, pageantry, drama, at least one very interesting men's sketch club (in Philadelphia), and all this reminds us once more that we must never forget that the arts are fundamentally social and not individual.

Some of you may know Adam Strohm's story of the distinguished Norwegian who came over here to attend a Librarians' conference, and who was literally horrified to find that, at the termination of the formal program, the gathering broke up without even a single song. He simply couldn't understand it. If this librarian had happened to be a Slav instead of a Scandinavian he would probably have expected a folk dance.

Imagine a group of librarians or college professors or presidents here bursting spontaneously into song or dance or both, and yet that is just what we need to break through our self-consciousness and our patterns of convention; that is fundamentally what the arts are for in our lives. It's as true today and here in this land of freedom as it was when Plato taught it in Greece.

Now let me point out something. So far as you and I have been prepared in college for this release from our precious selves, has it been through the formal curriculum? It has not. It has been through the side-shows, the student activities. I sometimes wonder if the educational historian of a hundred years hence will be tempted to refer to the scheme of studies so highly regarded today as the student passivities. He may, if we don't do something pretty radical along the lines of our discussion today.

And this brings me to the only definite suggestion I dare to make. Whatever we do in the arts, don't let us prescribe

it. "What advantageth it" us to point to immense registration figures if what we are really doing is to raise up a generation of young people to loathe the arts and not to love them. We don't have to look very far afield for dreadful warnings. Let the arts earn their way. I for one am no believer in the merits of protective tariffs, in education or elsewhere.

I was talking not very long ago with a wise man, Herbert Fisher, who framed the British Education Act. We were discussing the very interesting scheme of adult education which is developing all over England, but what he said applies equally well to the arts. What he said was in substance this:

"You cannot impose any program from above. You must have a real local demand, a real nucleus of people no matter how small, who themselves know that they want to do something and want to do it together. You can build on that, but you can't impose the desire from outside. We have learned to watch patiently, and when we find this desire in any community, then His Majesty's Government is only too glad to help out. But the Government doesn't say, 'Let there be a movement of this kind or that kind or the other kind' and assume it exists because we say so, and then wonder why we fail when we try to carry it beyond the point of non-existence."

Never mind if our beginnings are small, so long as what we do accomplish is honest and sound. As a matter of fact, with our shortage of competent teachers we are or ought to be limited to small beginnings. But let us build for great things in the future, and as part of that process let us stop thinking of what we lack, comprehensive as that subject may be, and turn our attention to some of the things we have to build on. Don't let us forget for instance that we have in America the art traditions, not of one race, but of all the world as a foundation for our structure. We are unique in this. Then the moment is propitious. We are at the end of our pioneering period, our improvising period,

and have no further excuse for our national shortcomings in the arts. We have all today an amount of leisure or rather an amount of time which we are free to dispose of as we like, greater than that available in any other part of the civilized world, and in spite of protests from faculty and students, let me insist that this applies to life in our colleges. We have wealth to apply—when we know how to apply it—beyond the dreams of any other people, and I don't mean wealth in money alone, but wealth in health and energy and in initiative. The best examples of all the arts are here to inspire us, the most brilliant performances in music, an unbroken migration of great works of art across the oceans from the west and from the east. The day is already here when the foreign connoisseur in certain branches must literally see America first.

Lastly, we have a national habit of succeeding in what we set out to do. Just as soon as a sufficient number of men and women are really persuaded that it is really worth while, then can we look forward to *the* place and not *a* place of the arts in American life and in American education.

A COLLEGE COURSE IN ART APPRECIATION

GEORGE C. NIMMONS, F. A. I. A.

Chairman of the Committee on Education,
American Institute of Architects

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish very briefly to give you some idea of the work which your Committee on Architecture has been carrying on for the last six years with our committee, the Committee on Education of the American Institute of Architects. Prior to that time our Committee on Education was interested largely in the education of the architect. That was the first undertaking on the program for our committee, and in this connection I might state that the schools of architecture of America are now as good and in some respects better for the education of American architects than the *Ecole des Beaux Arts* of Paris, where a generation ago nearly all our students went for their training. There are now eighteen accredited schools of architecture in this country whose courses have been approved by the American Institute of Architects, and they offer the best education in architecture that is to be obtained.

The architects realized some time ago that in order to advance architecture and to lead this country to advance in that art and perhaps sometime create a great national style of its own, there was another thing essential besides educating and training the architect, and that was educating and training the public so that the soil would be fertile in which the seeds of this art were to be planted.

Early in its efforts your committee joined with us and we went to work. The thing which we thought would be most useful to do first was to produce a new book on the fine arts, which was done. We were able to get ten of the most distinguished artists in the country in the various arts to combine with us and to produce a book which was

called "The Significance of the Fine Arts." That book went out and it was universally well received by the press throughout the country, it is growing in popularity, it has become the leading text-book in many of our leading colleges for courses on the appreciation of art, and we feel that that work is perhaps the standard work of our time on the question of the fine arts, that is, for laymen. It represents perhaps the most up-to-date and the most exact expression of the ideas of the artists of our time.

Following that, the next endeavor of the committee was another work which was not quite so difficult to do, but we felt it was very important. We found that there was no uniformity, no standardized ideas in regard to how art should be taught in college for the layman, that is, courses in art for the appreciation of art and not for its practice. So the committee went to work and produced an outline of a course of art study to be adopted by the average college. This outline has been printed and is now ready for free distribution by the Secretary of the American Institute of Architects at Washington, and each college of this association is to receive a copy of this outline, sent out with a letter from Dr. Cowling and his committee, recommending it for future consideration. Other copies may be had by writing to the Secretary, Mr. E. C. Kemper, of Washington, of the American Institute of Architects.

Now in producing this course of study it was not easy to determine what was the best way to give a student who was going to follow some other line of work a proper knowledge and appreciation of the fine arts. Of course it is an immense subject. The time to do it is limited, and it was, of course, realized that this course must be short. It was a question of choosing the most useful things to be supplied in a limited time, and with perhaps an incomplete equipment on the part of the college to give this course. This course was prepared by Professor Smith of Washington University; it received the criticism of our committee, and, as I say, it is now ready for distribution. It will, of course,

be criticized, that is what we want; there is no standard course in existence, and we want to put this out as a beginning around which we hope will be crystallized the ideas of the different colleges and their art teachers throughout the country.

This course may lean more to a historical teaching of art than it does to an elementary practice of art, and there may be a question in the minds of many people that art appreciation and knowledge of the principles of art can be taught better by laboratory work than they can by lectures and recitations and a limited amount of that, but we offer this course with the hope that it may be useful and that you may find value in it. There is also a bibliography connected with it that contains the lists of books and works that have been recommended by some of our best authorities.

I want now to conclude with one word in regard to the need for art training in America. It is a surprising situation that our system of education does not recognize art training more than it does. Perhaps that may be explained by the fact that colleges, like architecture, reflect the character of the people. Our people in the past have not had much time for art and they have not been much interested in art, but art training nevertheless and the things which it stands for are what the American people are greatly in need of. That is, the American citizen generally lacks in his personality or character that trait which is developed by art training and which is absolutely essential to success in almost any profession or calling that he may choose. I refer to the faculty of good taste. We all know that many of our boys come from farms and from homes where the lack of means has prevented their getting those refinements and that cultural influence which is supposed to be acquired by their education; they come to college, and they may become intellectual giants, but that thing which they so much need when they go out to make their way in the world, the development and refinement of their personal taste, they do not get, because as a rule there is no instruction in the

fine arts. Aside from its effect on human character, training in art has a great many benefits that may be credited to it.

As a subject of study it is very beneficial, in that it has great value that is informational, disciplinary, and cultural.

Art also has a great part to play in industry. Successful business in an industry depends largely on the design of the manufactured products produced. Our products compare poorly with those of the rest of the world, and if we are to compete with the world overseas in commerce, we must improve the design of our products and not have to send to Europe for designers. If the head of each business concern only knew those few simple principles that any artist or any man that had any training in the fine arts knows, American products would at once improve and the present handicap of design would be removed.

A little knowledge of architecture, painting, sculpture, landscape and design would help every man in building and refining his own home, and in taking part as an official of his own town or village, in creating the public buildings and their surroundings. The pleasure, the joy of appreciating the masterpieces of the world and the beauties of nature are alone sufficient reason for the study of art; art gives man's character that spiritual side, which the materialism of our age and the materialism of our colleges do not give, and the lack of which is the one great missing link, in our opinion, in the education of the American people.

Thank you.

FRANCO-AMERICAN RECIPROCITY***ROBERT L. KELLY**

There has been Franco-American reciprocity from the beginning. The two Republics were together in their birth struggles and they have been together ever since in sympathy and aspiration. From LaFayette and Franklin to Jusserand and Dawes, they have been one in the effort to realize life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, for each and all.

The present chapter in reciprocity within the educational field was opened by the Association of American Colleges at its annual meeting in Chicago in January, 1918. A resolution was then passed authorizing the officers of the Association to secure scholarships for French students in American colleges. This was done to the number of 135, a representative of the Association was sent to France to assist in the selection of the scholars, and in September, 1918, 105 French students, mostly girls, finally arrived in America and were placed in the colleges from New England to California.

Meantime, the office of the Association had been merged temporarily with that of the Emergency Council on Education at Washington, which soon became the American Council on Education, and in the name of both organizations and with the assistance of the United States Bureau of Education, the necessary negotiations had been carried on with the French authorities. With the signing of the Armistice, the administration of the scholarship plan was returned to the office of the Association, which, joining with the Catholic officials who brought a supplementary group, welcomed 122 French scholars the second year.

* Dr. Kelly represented the Association as Exchange Professor on the Kahn Foundation of the University of Paris in a series of lectures on phases of American college administration and life, May and June, 1924.

In response to the courtesy of the French authorities, the Association had the pleasure also to select and transfer to French Lycées the second year a group of American girls.

For the past five years the plan has been administered by the American Council on Education with the active assistance of the Institute of International Education, and in conformity with general principles established and modified from time to time by a joint committee made up of representatives of several associations, including the Association of American Colleges. During the current year responsibility for the plan was assumed entirely by the American Council on Education.

Although the number of French students brought to this country has been greatly reduced, being now less than one-third that of the first two years, it continues to be the colleges of this Association that make the plan possible, since it is this group of colleges almost without exception that offers the scholarships to French students.

It was in recognition of the large part this Association and its colleges had taken in the inauguration and administration of the plan that the National Office of French Universities conferred the honor upon the Association of inviting its Executive Secretary to visit the French universities and to deliver a course of lectures in Paris during the academic year, 1923-24. The months of May and June were selected for the lectures and such visits as the brief allowance of time made possible.

The lectures were delivered, with illustrations at the suggestion of the National Office of French Universities, in the amphitheatre Descartes at the Sorbonne. An effort was made to set forth certain phases of the administration and life of American colleges and universities not characteristic of French universities. The lectures were attended by representative members of the faculty and student body of the Sorbonne, of the national officers of educational administration, and of the general public. The pictures were furnished to the number of about four hundred by

our colleges and universities, and in their name the originals were deposited with Professor Charles Cestre, of the Department of American Civilization of the University.

I wish to venture a few words with reference to the reception accorded Mrs. Kelly and myself—for Mrs. Kelly was included in the invitation and on my authority is a worthy representative of the Association—by the National Office of French Universities, the Association of Franco-American Scholars, and by members of the University. We were met at Havre at five o'clock in the morning by the President and Secretary of the Association of Franco-American Scholars, who also represented the National Office of French Universities, and throughout our entire visit we were shown every attention officially and privately. We attended dinners and dances, teas and receptions, and picnics, and were made happy in French homes. Former scholars served as guides to places of interest and taught us anew the ways of buses and street cars and taxis and subways, as well as of French university life. We were entertained in the marvelous Kahn gardens. We spoke before the Debating Club of the Sorbonne.

The plan started in 1918 with the offering of scholarships and soon developed into the exchange of scholars. The personal relationships which the plan has made possible between hundreds of French and American young people are in themselves values of the highest order. They have contributed and will contribute still more to international understanding. But the larger values, perhaps, are to be found in the exchange of ideas, in the better reciprocal understanding of the genius, as well as the manners and customs of the two intellectually kindred peoples.

As a possible aid in facilitating this form of reciprocity, an effort is here made to set forth some of the marks of distinction in the two types of educational administration. As was stated by the committee of French and American experts which in 1922 recommended conditions of admission to French universities for American students who may become candidates for certain degree

"The French and American educational systems differ radically; not only are their respective organizations dissimilar, but there are also profound differences of method and objectives."

Certain concrete illustrations will tend to bring these differences into relief.

*French Students Find in
America*

1. The absence of a national system of higher education. Parallel groups of institutions supported by taxation on the one hand and by voluntary gifts on the other, maintain an almost equal balance in enrollment and equipment and in public estimation. Each institution, of which there are 200 or 1,000—depending on the definition—essentially independent and autonomous. Unity of effort and concert of purpose attained through voluntary associations.

2. Control by boards of trustees, made up largely of educational laymen, of whom an increasing number are former stu-

*American Students Find in
France*

1. A state system of education concentrated largely in Paris, with sixteen provincial universities of lesser size and resources. A high degree of uniformity characterizes the universities, although a differentiation of function is arising on the basis of location and environmental resources. While higher education is not considered in terms of independent institutions, there are a few independent ones, notably the Catholic University, whose students, however, have their degrees conferred upon them by the State University.

There are two or three independent theological faculties whose diplomas are not officially recognized. The University of Strasbourg, since 1918 a French state university, includes two full-fledged theological faculties, one Protestant and one Catholic. Teacher qualifications in all cases are prescribed and enforced by the state. Indeed, all French education is completely standardized by the state.

2. Control by the state through the Ministry of Public Instruction, which issues decrees carrying the force of law. The method

dents. In practice, the method places great power in the hands of the President.

A movement toward faculty representation on boards of trustees.

3. Aims of education variously stated as self-discovery, character building, development of personality, scholarship, social efficiency.

4. Articulation between secondary school and college, while definite in mathematical terms, is subject to constant adjustment in subject-matter and method.

5. Methods democratic. Some education for all; no limit to the possible attainment of the few. Emphasis on the "average" student. Danger of mediocrity. The "grind" an object of popular disapproval. The status of the "shark" somewhat doubtful.

Growing attention to the exceptional student and increasing provision for the fuller realization of his potentialities.

has the disadvantage of a bureaucracy and the advantage afforded by trained specialists. Since the law of 1918-1919 each university admits local citizens to its university council, and the property of the university is held in the name of the council.

3. The aim of education is scholarship. It is a modern version of the Greek conception. Benan's maxim holds: "Train a man's mind and the rest will take care of itself."

4. Articulation between Lycée and University definite and uniform throughout the Republic.

5. Educational aristocracy. "A French university professor will seldom go out of his way to save a drowning student." The system constructed and maintained alone for exceptional students. Others are branded as "cretins" or "caneres." A few survive and are promoted; many—not a few of them almost equally fit—are cast out and become sterile.

This is because there are few jobs and many candidates, and the universities are devoted to professional preparation or highly specialized advanced studies in the arts and sciences. The problem is essentially social; the solution takes no account of general non-specialized education above the Lycée.

6. The college largely a buffer institution. Between the upper (university) and the nether (high school) millstone. Is not comparable either to the Lycée or the French University. Much of its work of secondary grade.

Encouraging tendencies toward its more complete intellectualization. Many colleges report definite progress in this respect.

7. Educational theory stated in terms of the student; adjustment of program to his needs and capacities. Enrichment and flexibility of program. No two institutions exactly alike; no two student curricula identical; no power or disposition to make them so.

8. The college a place of orientation. Studies non-vocational, organized around general fields of knowledge and broad divisions of human activity.

9. Tendency away from literary, abstract and formal culture. General emphasis on social ser-

6. The American college has no French equivalent, but is considered an anachronism. Some professors of science have expressed the need of a period between the Lycée and the university for laboratory experience.

7. Emphasis on subjects of study. Student curricula restricted and pursued intensively. Strict adherence to examination requirements, which have very restricted electives. No required lectures or courses in the American sense. Students do browse around in lectures, in libraries and in other ways beyond the limits of the examination requirements.

8. The standard definition of the university was expressed by former Recteur Liard, who may justly be considered the father of the modern French university system, in three functions:

(a) General culture (now open to the public as well as to matriculated students. Each full professor required to give one course of public lectures).

(b) Professional training for teachers.

(c) Research.

9. French universities jealously preserve literary, abstract and formal culture, but have elimi-

vice. A recent authoritative report indicates increased attention to classical studies. One tendency is to make culture "hum"; another is to think of culture as an overtone—"a fine essence of other things—of personality and initiative and creative energy in any of the great fields of human endeavor."

10. Educational experimentation encouraged. Rapidity and amplitude of growth in education probably unparalleled in history. At one extreme, readiness to break images, cast out anachronisms, adopt fads, accept some new thing.

11. Close association of pure and applied sciences with arts and with one another. Standards equally high in arts and sciences. B.S. degree and higher degrees for scientific work, in a given institution considered of equal value with the corresponding arts degree.

12. Organized recreation as a means of education, with manifest excesses. Education for leisure. Opportunities for developing personal and group loyalties, sense of solidarity, student fellowship, power of student initiative in wide range of affairs; the social life emphasized. Love

nated entrance requirements, established a parallel system of degrees and special institutes for those (including foreigners) who have not done the preliminary work required by the traditional standards. These degrees have a university stamp and an endorsement of a kind, but they do not qualify for public careers as do the state degrees.

10. At the other extreme, while there has been during this century, and especially since the World War, a transformation of French universities amounting almost to a revolution, tradition still dominates important phases of French education. Culture is more slowly breaking through ancient fortifications.

11. The familiar formula of Dean Darboux, often quoted, that the Faculty of Sciences in Paris is a feudal body, applied to conditions before the 20th century. A considerable number of technical institutes has been added to every French Faculty of Sciences since 1897. The *D. és Sc.* has a different meaning from the *D. és L.*

12. Institutional life not emphasized. Do this one thing. Development on intellectual side—capacity for criticism and synthesis. Tendency more to individual than social development. Significant steps away from the characteristic loneliness of the French student noted in the de-

of *Alma Mater*. Manifestations of alumni loyalty.

velopment of University Cité and the Women Students' House of the University of Paris, and in the Association of Franco-American Scholars. "Comradeship in l'Ecole Normale and l'Ecole Polytechnique is as much alive and intense as, if not more than, that in any foreign university." Beginnings of student club life in some form in all universities.

American institutions in Paris that exemplify the same tendencies—the American University Union, American Association of University Women's Club, and the American Library School.

13. Mass production—making the product by machinery. Multitudes of rules, regulations, devices, etc., with officers for administering them. Extensive personnel studies conducted by scientific methods to serve in curriculum building.

13. Product largely self-made outgrowth of individualization of university activities. Much personal contact between the unusually exceptional student and his professors.

14. Tendency to take scientific spirit and method into religious and social life. The religious impulse a constant factor in American education.

14. The church and social science more remote.

15. Benevolence on part of rich and poor. Millions contributed to educational institutions annually by individuals and foundations. Alumni sometimes highly organized for annual contributions.

15. State support. University Cité, the gift of Mr. Deutsh; the Women Students' House built by state and private subscription. There is a beginning of campaigns and "drives" for educational purposes; also a recently established student loan fund.

16. Promotion and degrees awarded on basis of an increas-

16. The crowning glory of the French system is the final ex-

ingly complex system of student measurements. The written term examination the chief basis of promotion in college. Gradual accumulation of "credits" for the degree. Qualifying, not competitive, examinations, with many concrete questions, hurried answers; a test chiefly of retentive memory. Student repeats from hastily written notes literal content of lectures previously given by the man who gives the examination. Little reflection or originality. Measured by French standards, our term examinations constitute professional malpractice. Tremendous student mortality due in part only to defensible processes of academic selection.

A growing disposition to substitute the general examination for the A.B. as well as for the higher degrees. Examinations for Ph.D. in some institutions are comprehensive and exacting, but in general there is need of great improvement in the art of examining.

amination. The régime of the Lycée is much more exacting than that of the American high school or college. Holders of the French *baccalauréat* have been subjected to a continual and searching process of selection. In general, the French purpose is to bring down as many as possible, although the rigidity of the process of elimination varies greatly with the several types of French degrees. The examinations proper are qualifying; others, especially *Agrégation*, competitive. In both cases there is a written examination preceding an oral one. In the written examination proper, students may select one question out of three based on previously prescribed books. The student writes on but one question. The percentage of failures in the qualifying examinations ranges from forty to ninety. It averages probably between fifty and fifty-five.

The *Agrégation* is the highest competitive examination in France. In the oral examination the student delivers a lecture to the Board of Examiners. For preparation for the lecture he has had an hour's notice, with the resources of the university library at his command. In the test he must demonstrate full command of subject-matter, but no amount of acquired knowledge is sufficient if he does not show himself also a master of form and style. The percentage of successful candidates for *Agrégation* will not

exceed twenty. It may go as low as five. The successful candidate is an *agrégé*—i.e., a fellow of the University of France, and entitled to an appointment.

The purpose of the higher examinations is not to test either the student's memory or the extent of his knowledge but the texture of his mind. His ability to organize and present facts and ideas, the accuracy of his style and language, his power of synthesis, his personality, his intellectual life—these are the objects of measurement on the part of the examiners.

There is no American equivalent for *Agrégation* or *D. ès L.* Under definitely stated conditions formulated by the Franco-American Committee above referred to, and approved by the French Ministry of Education, American students may be admitted to both these examinations as well as to all others.

17. In general, the American method has fewer restrictions on student life in the high school than are found in the French Lycée. The college is less paternalistic than the Lycée, but more so than the French university.

18. The cost of higher education in America is relatively high and is increasing, although there are many provisions for reducing

17. Self-government in French universities is often held up as a model. It may be forgotten that even here the Ministry has many prescriptions.

18. The fees for French education are very low. "The total fees of a five-year medical course come to 1,640 francs."

the cost on the part of energetic and capable students. Millions of dollars for necessary expenses are earned annually by students working on part time.

19. While not bearing exclusively on the problems of higher education, it is interesting to observe the effort on the part of many American educational leaders to attain Federal centralization, with a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet. The ends sought are greater efficiency and more uniform distribution of educational privileges.

19. Effort on the part of many French educational leaders for decentralization as a means to a more socialized program of education.

It has been suggested that there should be one point more in this study to this effect, that with the proper fusing of the American way and the French way a well nigh perfect formula might emerge. Perhaps the largest fruitage of the Association's Exchange Scholarship Plan, and of other plans which are multiplying in number, will be the attainment of at least a nearer approximation to this ideal. But, after all, education is, among other things, a process of adaptation, and it is not to be expected or desired that a single formula will be developed sufficiently comprehensive to include the racial and environmental differences which guarantee to the world the two great Republics, each with its own body and soul.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORLD RELATIONS

DR. YUSUKE TSURUMI,
Tokio, Japan

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been deeply moved by the kind words that the Chair expressed towards my country. I came to America in August to attend the conference of the Institute of Politics in Williamstown, and ever since I have been talking on different occasions at different cities, and in no single case have I met with any cool reception, much less discourtesy, and I have gathered by my personal experience that the feeling of this great nation is extremely friendly to Japan. (Applause.)

In Japan before I left our shores I had occasions to do my humble part, it may be a baby's step, for the promotion of a better feeling between your country and mine, particularly after the passing of the immigration law, when the feeling was not good in Japan. I had occasions to stand up before packed houses and spoke very frankly about the futility or of the shame of making fuss about this immigration bill. I even went, so far as to say, that it was not to the dignity of a great nation, the Japanese, to stoop so low as to get angry about this thing, and I told them, "When I go to America, I am going to speak very frankly what the Japanese are thinking about, but here in Japan I am not going to speak in that way to arouse your sentiment."

I spoke in a very big meeting on the 1st of July when the immigration law came into force in Tokio, the intercollegiate students' meeting; when I spoke this, instead of being heckled down, the whole audience, two thousand strong, rose from their chairs and cheered me. (Applause.) There I think I have the assurance that politics is not going to interfere with the real sentiment of our two nations. This I am not speaking because I am in America; I had spoken this before I left Japan.

Since I came to this country I have been speaking frankly or too frankly about the impression of the Japanese on this question, but here to-night I have a great privilege indeed to speak briefly on the higher education of Japan.

Now there is a proverb, I should say almost a proverb, among the western world that Japanese are too polite to be frank. That set me thinking years ago. Now I came to my own interpretation. That is partly due to education and partly due to the difference of social heritage in which we Japanese are brought up.

In the case of education, I have listened with great interest to Dr. Kelly's comparison of French education and American education. Now I should like to compare briefly the difference between the Anglo-Saxon education system and the Japanese. I think one of the greatest contributions of the Anglo-Saxon race to the world's civilization is the development of personality. You think in the terms of personality, and your education is based on the desire of developing the personality of each and every individual, and in that respect I think you have achieved a great deal. In Japan there is a great difference. Our educational system, and our whole scheme of life are not based on personality; they are based on the theory or rather the sense of harmony.

When a Japanese comes to himself, the thing that comes to him is not his individuality or personality. Because of the long training we are thinking almost unconsciously and intuitively in terms of the harmony of the whole universe. We always think of the relationship between ourselves and the scheme of the whole universe, the scheme of the whole country, the scheme of the whole family. The most important thing for us is how to maintain a harmonious position with our surroundings, the family, the village, the state and the universe. Because of this we have toned down the bold and confident personality and blurred the sense of distinction. In that respect we are far behind the critical and searching spirit of the West. This can be explained by a few examples.

About two hundred years ago there was a famous artist, Tanyu. He was asked to paint on the screen of a famous Buddhist temple in the city of Kyoto. It was an honor for a painter to be asked to paint on the screen of a sacred temple, so this great master did his best, and after some weeks the painting was completed. The lord abbot of the temple came out and inspected the temple. On the screen was painted a figure. He had a wine casket and had a long beard, and the lord abbot noticed that it was the famous picture of a Chinese poet, Lipo, but Lipo is always painted with two things, the wine casket in which he carried this strong water and was frequently intoxicated, and he was always standing beside a big waterfall. The lord abbot looked at the picture and said quietly, "Master, haven't you forgotten something to paint? Is this not the picture of Lipo?"

Tanyu said, "Yes."

"Why, you have forgotten to paint the waterfall."

Thereupon the painter stood up from the matting and quietly walked to the other side of the room and opened the screen and pointed to the garden and behold there was a beautiful waterfall in the garden. "Here is the waterfall. What is the use of duplicating the same waterfall on this screen?" He had a perfect harmony of the garden and the house and the painting. That was the intuitive reaction on the Japanese mind, and I could enumerate any number of this kind of stories.

In each and every Japanese the sense of harmony is so deeply ingrained that we unconsciously think impersonally in the terms of the whole scheme of life and not in the terms of our individual self; considering the vastness of this scheme of the whole universe, our individuals are so infinitesimally small.

Since the great war European statesmen, quite a number, have written autobiographies, explaining and justifying their actions during the war, but in the history of Japan, not a single public servant has written his autobiography

because he was a public servant, and he has done his humble part for the state, for the universe, and his own story is so infinitesimally small compared to the great scheme of life, so when he is indicted in any way, the public men will never explain themselves or try to justify themselves but will quietly retire. If the thing a man has done was to be vindicated, that vindication would come by itself, by the scheme of the whole life of the nation.

I do not lay emphasis on this fact in any boastful sense, it has advantages as well as disadvantages. That is the scheme, or rather fundamental idea behind the education of the Japanese. So when you ask a Japanese some question, he has not in many cases his individual personal opinions. His opinions are submerged in the whole trend of opinions of the country.

Now there is another thing which will help to explain this situation. The education in Japan meant not the building of character or developing your power of judgment. I think American education has been particularly successful in developing and promoting the power of judgment in the students in their school days, but in Japan education meant in the old days memory. We had to memorize a tremendous number of Chinese characters, running from fifty to one hundred thousand, and we had to memorize the idiomatic expressions of the Chinese classics, otherwise we could not write with clearness or distinction.

That led to the emphasis of memory education. So that was brought over even during the past fifty years of modern education, as you will notice if you happen to see a Japanese interpreting for his friend or senior. He will stand side by side with his friend who will talk in Japanese for twenty to thirty minutes, and the former will interpret him word for word offhand. That is the result of long training of memory.

Another thing, the Japanese by nature or by training, has the fondness of abstractions, theories and generalizations, whereas your Anglo-Saxon mind reacts on the concrete things and comes to the direct conclusions quickly.

Let us explain this fact by one example. For instance, you meet a Japanese and put a question to him, "What do you think about immigration?" Now let me explain to you when you put that question to me or to my friends what is going on in the inside of a Japanese head. A Japanese head, if he happens to have some brains, will work in this way: "Now, let's see, he said immigration. What is the philosophical meaning of immigration? Immigration means the free transportation of people, regardless of the boundary lines of the state. And on what basis? On the basis of justice among humanity." There he has the major premise. Then what does he think next? Then he will search out what is justice. There his memory comes to his help. He does not try to think out the meaning of justice but he will try. "Now, let's see, what did Confucius say about justice? What did Mencius say about justice? In the text-book I was taught in school what was the meaning of justice. What did Marquis Okuma say?"

So in that way he goes through his memories in quest of some passages of the leaders in Japan. Then he will put these together and build up his philosophic basis about immigration. Now the Anglo-Saxon mind works along the line of induction, but our Japanese mind works in the line of deduction. So from that major premise he gradually comes down and tries to approach the conclusion logically, step by step.

In the meanwhile what is happening in the mind of the questioner, the American? He looks at the face of the Japanese who is trying to formulate his theory and thinks, "Now, this fellow is going to evade the question and dodge the issue." (Laughter.)

Then what is the first word the Japanese will utter? He will say, "Yes, I think immigration is based on the philosophy of justice, it is not?" Why, it is ten thousand miles apart from what the questioner wanted to get. "The Japanese is too polite to be frank! He does not want to refuse to answer the question, but he would rather say

something else." Then the impatient questioner could not wait until this Japanese can in imperfect English slowly approach the question.

But let us study the other side of the story. When a Japanese puts a question to an American or Englishman, particularly the American, quick comes the answer on any philosophical question. You don't even refer to Plato. (Laughter.) Then it is so surprising to the Japanese, particularly the Japanese who have not been educated in Anglo-Saxon atmosphere, they think in some cases it is shocking because they would expect a more detailed explanation and longer process of logic, but all of a sudden you jump to a conclusion. So if you study the different systems of education, this becomes clear.

Let me follow the trend of the educational system in Japan very briefly. With this social heritage of love of harmony, the love of abstractions, and the preponderance of memory, we have built up a curious system of education in the past half century. When the western civilization rushed into Japan with its scientific, critical and analytic system, it swept the whole Japanese people off their feet. It was so dazzling and it was so amazingly interesting. So in the first few years they tried to drop all the Japanese training and to shift entirely from the Japanese training to the western training, but gradually the same old Japanese love of harmony and other traits came back, and particularly Japanese have two national traits. One is a quick response to foreign and new ideas, and then later a tremendous resistance or opposition to the exotic ideas.

In the first few years the Japanese responded to the western analytical system of thought, but gradually the same old thing came about. In what way did it work? In brief, it worked out in formulating a new nationalism. That is with the assistance of western thought, the Japanese statesmen or people who were in power formulated a new system of philosophy of nationalism and this nationalism was made the basis of the educational system. So in the

past fifty years the infusion of nationalism along the line of Hegelian philosophy was the backbone of the Japanese system, and what was the actual result? The same thing can be said about the French school system in a different grade. It worked in this way: in 1868 when the Japanese government was changed, and the Emperor was restored to the legitimate seat of power, it was by the force of four feudal lords, and two of these dropped off and only two remained in power. Of those two who dropped out, one organized a progressive party along the British liberal philosophies, and the other organized a liberal party along the French school, but those two who remained in power borrowed their philosophy from German schools and consolidated themselves in power and they did a most interesting thing which I think is the secret of the endurance of the Japanese bureaucracy. They built up a thorough system of government schools. In the first place, we borrowed the American system of public schools and built schools all over the country where the children from seven to thirteen were educated, compulsory education—six years of compulsory education and after that compulsory education, boys and girls had to go to high schools which we called middle schools, for a five year course, and after the five year course of high school, they had to go three years to college, and after the three years of college life, they had to go into the university for four years.

Here comes the most interesting part: the government gave a high place to the government schools and those boys who were going through the government system of schools with good records got national recognition in their young days, so when you reach the age of college life, then you have to apply to a severe test of entrance examination to the college.

In my days there were only eight in the whole Empire and all the graduates of the middle schools were to have a national contest to get into national colleges, and those who got the highest mark were sent to the first national

college in Tokio and the one who stood at the head of that whole contest is the best boy for that whole year. Then after three years of severe competition in college, you go to the university, the government imperial university (there were only two in my days), and when you went there, and stood well in the examinations your name was published all over the country. The head boy of the five hundred classmates is known all over the country. Then when you graduate from the imperial university, there is another barrier set before you, that is the higher civil service examination system, and all the graduates of both private and government universities apply for this higher civil service examination, not only those who wanted to enter the civil service, but all those boys who are ambitious enough to get national recognition. He who stood at the head of the higher civil service examination of that year is the brightest young man of that year.

In that way gradually the government concentrated the attention of all the young men and women of the country to this school system. Those boys who stood at the head of the class in the government schools were not from the wealthy, they were recruited mostly from the lower classes. In that way the oligarchy at the head of the government skimmed the cream of the nation and incorporated the ambitious element into their scheme who otherwise would have meant trouble for the government. That was the secret of the endurance of the bureaucracy in Japan and those boys who went to the government schools were not boys who had means to support themselves. Here our system of harmony worked.

When there is a young child of ten or eleven who is doing remarkably well in the primary school, always the head boy, and he is very poor, he has no money to go to a higher school, middle school, then somebody will recognize his ability and think, "Now this is a boy worth while supporting," and an entirely unknown man will come and pick him up and send him to the high school, and if he stands

well, head or second boy in the high school, then some other fellow will come and pick him up and send him to the national college and gradually this boy will be sent on from place to place to higher schools and will emerge into the ruling class, so to speak. So in this way the ambitious, discontented elements were gradually taken away from the submerged nine-tenths.

If you will study the creation of the twenty prime ministers of Japan in the past thirty years, you will notice that out of twenty there is only one prime minister who inherited his title from his forefathers. The other nineteen came from the bottom of society, gradually worked their way up to the head of the system, and that was because of this intense competitive system in the government schools.

What was the philosophy that was infused into these good brains of the country? That was nationalism which was given by the government, so I think in that sense the statesmen of the past thirty or forty years were very clever. They know how to rule the country, and before I graduated from the university and before I spent some years in the civil service, I did not realize how we were trained.

Let us study then, with this intense nationalism and tremendous competitive system if there is any room for Japanese young men and women to think internationally. Here I think is the most interesting part. Before 1868 Japan was divided into three hundred odd provinces, and in those days people who were born in one particular village or province were not allowed to migrate into neighboring provinces. So they considered those people who belonged to other domains as foreigners. There was no nationalistic consciousness in the Japanese minds before 1868. But after the restoration in Japan in 1868, the statesmen of Japan gradually educated the whole nation to think nationally, as I think in the early '50's Webster said to his countrymen to think continentally, and in the late '90's Chamberlain was telling the Englishmen to think imperially. So in the early days of the '60's and '70's

Japanese statesmen were teaching the Japanese not to think provincially but to think nationally, and they succeeded in infusing into the Japanese mind this solid nationalistic consciousness.

Now if a nation can develop from sectionalism to nationalism in twenty or thirty years, and with this background of harmony, that is to say with this tradition of thinking in this harmony with the scheme of the whole universe, there is no reason why this process could not be pushed one step further and the Japanese could not be taught to think internationally, and I think I will cite a few things. When the League of Nations came, it went very deeply into the mind of the Japanese, and why? Because the League of Nations appealed to the thinking part of the Japanese for it had a philosophy behind it. It was not the direct, concrete conclusion or solution of one program, but it was an attempt to solve the whole scheme of the universe with a philosophic system which appealed to the Japanese. Even the politicians began to change their views.

I will cite one case. There is one strong statesman in Japan, T. Inukai, who has been fighting for forty years for the cause of democracy in Japan. Now he is minister of communications in the present cabinet. Just before I left Japan, I visited him and talked for three hours and he told me an interesting thing. He is a shrewd politician, perhaps the greatest parliamentarian that Japan has ever produced. He said, "When the League of Nations came, I changed my whole policy and politics. Before the days of the League of Nations, I based my theory or policies on war. It was the age of competition, and Japanese policies were bound to be based on that theory. Therefore, I based my foreign policy on the division of China by Western powers, which I had imagined was coming, but after the League of Nations was put into actual force, I began to think. Now the world has changed, or at least is changing into a new age of conciliation and cooperation, and my entire foreign and domestic policy is changed. I

am assured of the integrity of China and on that basis I have changed the entire policy of Japanese politics. I began to agitate for the reduction of the navy and army," which he did and he succeeded. He fought for the reduction of the navy and more strongly he fought for the reduction of the army, and he cut down two divisions and he is now urging to cut down four more divisions, and he is trying to educate the Japanese to industrialize the nation along the lines of peace. So we are very quick to respond to the outside changes, and because of this ingrained sense of harmony, I think if there is no danger of our political independence before our eyes, the Japanese nation will gradually emerge out of this strong nationalistic sense and take off the edges of the narrow nationalism and gradually will think in the terms of the whole world, and that is very marked among the students of Japan, particularly among the university and college boys. They are getting more and more interested in this scheme of the whole world, the spirit of cooperation and conciliation.

This I am not saying simply because I am talking to the American audience. This I think the whole world will gradually begin to realize. So the ideas or the trend of opinions among the young men of Japan are not being felt by Japan herself nor by the outside world, but from ten to twenty years from now I think you will gradually hear about the changing psychology of the Japanese along the international line.

The evening is getting so late, I am not going to take any more of your time. I thank you for your kind attention. (The audience arose and applauded.)

**A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
A DEFENSE OF THE BROWN PLAN**

**PRESIDENT JOHN H. MACCRACKEN,
Lafayette College**

When your Executive Secretary assigned me this subject, he had, I am sure, no idea of how timely a subject it would prove to be.

Under date of January 5, 1925, the President's Secretary, Mr. Slemp, wrote to Senator Smoot and other Senators and Congressmen as follows:

"The President has been advised that the bill for the reorganization of the executive departments formulated by the joint committee on reorganization was introduced into the Senate by you and is on the calendar. He thinks it important that action on this bill be taken at this session and hopes that you will call it up and press for passage at an early date."

To which Senator Smoot has replied that he will do all in his power to bring the matter to a vote before March 4.

Mr. Brown was chairman of the Joint Committee on Reorganization, and the plan referred to is the Brown plan. The particular aspect of it in which we are interested this morning is the provision made in the plan for the creation of a Department of Education and Relief.

As an introduction and background to the discussion that is to follow, I ask you, therefore, to go back with me and examine the general idea underlying the suggestion that education be represented in the supreme council of our Nation.

A hundred and sixty years ago Buttafuoco, a Corsican soldier of distinction, wrote to Rousseau, "Our Island, as you have very well said, sir, is capable of receiving a good system of laws. But it needs a legislator. It needs a man of your principles, a man whose happiness is independent of us; a man who knows human nature from top to bottom; who, husbanding a distant glory may be willing to work

in one age and to enjoy in another. Condescend to trace the plan of a political system and to cooperate in the felicity of a whole nation." "But," says Mr. Herbert Fisher who relates the incident. "the day has gone by when a philosopher eminent for his abstract meditations, receives an invitation to legislate for a community in trouble about its soul."

I am not so sure that this is so, but if it be so it is because we lack the man willing to meditate abstractly, and husbanding a distant glory to work in one age and to enjoy in another. If any group should be willing to meditate and if needs be to legislate for a community in trouble about its soul, it is such a group as this. You are for the most part representatives of independent colleges, you are not dependent on our present form of political organization, you have no personal advantage to gain from modifications of our political structure, you are, as Buttafuocco wrote Rousseau, men of principles, whose happiness is independent of the solution of the problem in question. You enjoy as great freedom of thought and of action as is vouchsafed to any man anywhere. To whom then better may be addressed an invitation to legislate for a community in trouble about its soul?

First then: Has our nation a soul or any business to concern itself with spiritual things? What human desires and instincts have a right to find expression in government? A monarchy, we say, may lust for territorial expansion and dream of world empire, but not a republic in the twentieth century. Cut throat competition and personal aggrandizement at the expense of the other fellow is all right, we say, for Wall Street but not for Capitol Hill. Capitol Hill may legislate regarding wealth, to increase it, to diminish it, to distribute and redistribute it. It may decree what men shall eat or drink, who their travelling companions shall be, what they shall hear over the radio, whether their mothers-in-law shall pass Ellis Island, what is kosher and what not kosher. It may even attempt to shape the tastes of the

nation in such matters as currency, spinning beautiful bright silver cartwheels to catch the fancy of the childlike citizens of the great Republic and so spare our poverty-stricken Uncle Samuel, who has most of the gold of the world in his vaults and who does most of his business by checks anyway, the cost of printing a little paper for pocket money.

What is the sphere of government? Why, anything that has to do with the silver dollar is the sphere of government, some answer. Government properly conceived in the eyes of the Chambers of Commerce of the United States is government of the Dollar, by the Dollar, for the Dollar, and they can prove it by the Bible. It is government as conceived and chartered in the New Testament. It rests upon Caesar's penny and the claim Caesar by his superscription has established to the penny. All that is material is Caesar's and properly the function of government—all that is spiritual belongs to another Kingdom, the Kingdom of Truth and is God's. Therefore, when Uncle Samuel calls a conference on the state of the nation, whom shall he summon. Well, not like Old King Cole—his pipe, his glass and his fiddlers three—but his Secretary of State to tell him what the other nations think about it, his Secretary of War and his Secretary of the Navy, because a generation from now we may need to fight again, his Attorney General because we are sure to have to go to law, his Postmaster General because the term of office is only four years, his Secretary of the Interior to report on the supply of oil, his Secretary of the Treasury to warn him against extravagance and pay the bills, and his three subsidiary Knights of the Silver Dollar, his Secretary of Agriculture to provide the food, his Secretary of Commerce to represent industry and trade, his Secretary of Labor to represent the trade unions. Do you wonder that Drinkwater portrays Abraham Lincoln as opening his cabinet meeting even in war time with stories from Artemas Ward in an effort to pry loose the minds of his counsellors from material things?

Is it, I ask you, a true conception of Government? Shall we as citizens reverse the Bible story and when we are asked concerning Education—Is it entitled to a seat at the council board of the nation?, answer, Has it silver dollars to get or to spend, bearing the fair head of Liberty? If so, it is the requisite token—admit it to the council chamber—if not, close the door upon it and give precedence to a Secretary of Works, a Secretary of Health, or even a Secretary of Painting and Sculpture, some one who at least deals in tangible things and who will be able to make his contribution to the jack pot in the common currency. Eight years ago when two or three of us went to consult a powerful Senator on the introduction of a bill to create a Department of Education, the powerful Senator, true representative of the Silver Dollar theory of government, said—"I should not be interested in seeing a new department created unless it has a lot of money to spend." And it was to express the Department of Education in terms such as he could understand, as well as to provide for crying needs, that the hundred millions found a place in the Smith-Towner bill.

We in America make our government in our own image. We have no government imposed by divine right. Even the Constitution which so many are laboring so vigorously to exalt to a position of divine right was the wise work of wise men. "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure its blessings to ourselves and our posterity, we the people of the United States" may, if we will, create a Department of Education. The fundamental question then is just this. Do we who are engaged in Education want Education represented in the national government? If we do, it will be represented. The great things are always simple. Some of us don't want it represented. They feel Education is too pure and modest a maiden to be sent so far from home. Her place is by the fireside or in the little red school house close by. If she corresponds, the letters

should not go farther than Springfield, and if she is permitted to receive callers they must not be aliens from Indiana or Iowa. If she sits in committee with rude and boisterous men like Agriculture and Labor, her purity will be smirched and she will be no maiden suitable to mate with us, no demure Lady Jane Grey to whom the love of learning is the only solace, but an Elizabeth learned and powerful indeed, yet sterile and tyrannical. The tender solicitude of some of our college presidents and of our Chambers of Commerce for the purity and freedom of our fair maid Education is as out of date as the determination of Mr. See to save our daughters from the wiles of a college education. The bogies which lurk in the political shadows are just as real and just as important as the dangers awaiting our girls in the shadowy college cloisters. They are there, they threaten, but somehow they do not strike. There may be lions in the way but if somebody has passed just ahead of you, you quickly discover they are chained. The farmers are not crying out against the tyranny of the Department of Agriculture, the Labor Unions are not shouting "Down with the Department of Labor," even the Chambers of Commerce seem reconciled to a Department of Commerce and a Federal Trade Commission. Is it strange, therefore, that Education refuses to be appalled by the monsters said to lurk on the road to Washington? We have experimented for sixty years with a modest Bureau of Education. We know from the experiment on a small scale what tendencies are likely to manifest themselves on a large scale and we are not afraid.

"There is," says Commissioner Tigert in his report just published, "pending before Congress a plan for the reorganization of the executive departments of the government, including within it a proposed department of education and relief. This new department would bring about an amalgamation of more than ten different bureaus and agencies now carrying on education wholly or in part and thus provide for a more efficient and economical adminis-

tration of affairs in the Federal Government. This plan has the hearty endorsement of the President."

The bill creating the new department now pending, provides that the province and duty of the Department of Education and Relief shall be to foster and promote public education and health and—irrelevantly enough—the interests as determined by law, of persons separated from the military or naval forces of the United States.

To the new department are to be transferred not only the existing educational agencies of the government, including the Federal Board for Vocational Education, but all the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department, and the whole Veterans' Bureau and Bureau of Pensions with their annual budgets of nearly half a billion dollars.

The new department is to be organized with a cabinet officer as secretary at a salary of \$12,000, and three assistant secretaries each with a salary of \$10,000—one in charge of Education, one in charge of Public Health, and one in charge of Relief.

That is the Brown plan named in the program which I am to defend. I defend it on the theory that a half loaf is better than no bread. I don't like the overloading of the Department with the work of relief—at least with the relief work of the World War. The pension business belongs to the Treasury. It is their job to pay the nation's bills. Soldiers' homes and hospitals belong to War and Navy and Labor rather than to Education. But these latter might be taken care of in a Department of Education and Health. If the Brown plan could be amended so as to slough off the intolerable detail of pensions, it would be as great an improvement for Education as it has been the last year, according to Commissioner Tigert, for the Bureau of Education to move out of the Pension Building into the Interior Building, and I think this change can be secured before the bill becomes a law.

It is a tremendous step forward to have won recognition in the platform of the victorious party for a Depart-

ment of Education of any kind and the endorsement of a President so overwhelmingly trusted by the nation. You will recall the progress made since I spoke to you on this subject five years ago. First there was to be a Department of Welfare, then a Department of Welfare and Education was conceded, later this became Education and Welfare, then Education and Relief, and before we meet again it may undergo one more transformation and emerge into the light of day as Education and Health. Health, I think, is more akin to Education than Relief. Both have to do with the future, both are children of hope and progress, both kindle the imagination with the untold possibilities of the new day.

I do not propose to take your time this morning to discuss details of a Department of Education. The Committees on Education of both the House and the Senate held hearings last winter and some fifteen hundred pages of fine type have been printed in the record. Those of you who are interested will find there the subject discussed pro and con from every angle. To my mind this is not a question of details any more than the League of Nations is a question of details. It is a question of vision—of your dream of the perfect State, of your inherent desire as teachers to live and to create. One could not talk with the late President Harding about a Department of Education without feeling that to his mind a teacher was a sort of superior domestic servant worthy of the same recognition that a prosperous farmer accords to the teacher of the country school who boards around from family to family. One could not hear the Senator from Utah in the last Congress describe the nefarious professors of chemistry who import duty free test tubes at two cents and sell them at ten cents and use the difference for their own purposes without realizing that the noble Senator regarded university professors as a sort of five and ten cent variety of crooks—too weak to be feared, too mean to be trusted. One cannot see the Bureau of Education ignored in matters of Federal Educa-

tion as in the recent Immigration Bill, which gave not to the Federal Commissioner of Education but to the Secretary of Labor the right to decide whether this or that college or university is a suitable institution for an alien to attend, and placed even Fair Harvard and Proud California in the position before the nations of the world of having first to seek the stamp of approval of the representative of Labor before the Department of State, charged with the administration of international relations, dare authorize its consuls to stamp the passport of a prospective student in Jerusalem or Allahabad bound for Cambridge or for Berkeley, without feeling that the million teachers in this country will be unworthy their free citizenship in a free land, if they do not demand a voice in the councils of the nation commensurate with the sacredness and dignity of their calling. The lions in the path—the fear of federal tyranny, the dread of introducing politics into the schools, are chained lions—they would be dangerous if there was nothing to hold them, or if the chains of unwritten law and human nature were to break, but they will not break, at least not without a revolution. The distrust of desire, or of reasonable self-respect as springs of action—a distrust peculiarly characteristic of our own profession—must yield to the compelling reasonableness of a loftier vision of the State in the new age when the nations shall learn war no more—and in the meantime we may rest assured that if we must fight, Education, as was found in the last war, has as much to contribute to a successful outcome as industry, if not more. Mr. Herbert Fisher who sat in the English cabinet during the war as the representative of Education was at my house recently and I asked him whether in Britain the President of the Board of Education was expected to confine his participation in the councils of the nation to matters directly concerned with Education. His reply was, not at all—that he was as free to counsel on any subject before the cabinet as any other member and he instanced the debate on the Gallipoli campaign in which he

had himself participated. It is quite conceivable that Mr. Fisher's advice on the subject was as good as that of the First Lord of the Admiralty or of the Secretary of State for War. It certainly could not have been much worse.

Let us not be concerned, therefore, lest there be nothing for a Secretary of Education to do because he cannot control or direct education in the States, or because he has not millions to give his children if they are good. It is conceivable that ideas may be as important as indices, that even flights of imagination may yield the nation more than filing cabinets, that if the new Secretary did nothing but lend an open ear to the thoughts and hopes and desires of the million teachers and twenty million scholars of the great Republic and put them into words for public consideration, his time might be fairly well occupied. And if, in addition, his office should become as complete a clearing house for international educational news as the Secret Service department of the Navy is for war news, or the consular service of State and Commerce for business news, with its educational attachés as listening posts the world around, the Department might become not only confidant and spokesman, but leader and teacher, and the new Secretary of Education, a man knowing human nature from top to bottom, husbanding a distant glory, willing to work in one age and to enjoy in another, might accept the invitation not of a Corsican soldier but of the schools and colleges of America and "condescend to trace plans for our educational system and to cooperate in the felicity of a whole nation."

DEBATE

RESOLVED: That the Sterling Bill Providing for a Department of Education and a Federal Subsidy for Education in the States Should Become Law.

Affirmative

PROFESSOR GEORGE D. STRAYER,
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I cannot help but feel that the first speaker of the morning, whether he participated in the debate or not, has given some indication of the outcome, for, after all, I believe that the things on which we agree are probably more important than those upon which we may have some disagreement.

I take it that as a result of the discussion which has gone on during the past six years in the United States, most of us are ready to accept the desirability of having education represented in the Cabinet of the President, but I must debate the issue as it relates to a bill. I would like to call your attention first of all to the fact that that measure was developed by those who, like yourselves, are interested in and who believe in the possible good that can come to this country of ours through the further development of its public school system. For fear you might think that only public school people were there represented, I am glad to record the fact that while there were five state superintendents of schools on the commission that drafted the bill, and seven city superintendents of schools, alongside of them sat the representatives of the endowed colleges and universities. The judgment recorded in the bill that was drafted was unanimously accepted, except for the fact that one member of the commission withdrew because of his protest against the inclusion of appropriations as a feature of that measure.

To debate an issue requires first of all that we know exactly what the issue is, and in the work which I have had the privilege of doing during these years in support of this measure, I have found in the most unexpected places misunderstandings and misconceptions with respect to the provisions of the bill. I hold in my hand the report of the hearing before the United States Senate, and properly in that hearing there is given first of all the bill. I am not going to read it, but I will ask that you believe that I am as correctly representing it as I can in the abstract which I present.

First, it provides that there shall be a Secretary of Education, and fixes his salary.

Second, that there will be transferred the Bureau of Education and such other branches of government as, in the wisdom of Congress, may be transferred to the department.

I hesitate to comment except to say that the members of the group drafting the bill felt that to engage in controversy as to whether or not this particular division or bureau should be included, might not further the general purpose that we had in mind.

There is the usual provision that the Secretary shall be in charge of buildings and libraries and the rest, and that the transfers from other divisions of government be put in his charge.

Then the first significant provision of the bill other than that the Secretaryship be established is that the department shall conduct research. The statement there is made general enough to provide for research in all departments of education.

An appropriation of \$500,000 is authorized to be added to all other appropriations then available in any of the branches or divisions of government that might be consolidated.

Then come five sections devoted to the proposal that the national government shall contribute to the states for cer-

tain specific purposes. For the removal of illiteracy \$7,500,000 is authorized, and the provision is that the money shall be distributed in the proportion that the number of illiterates in any state bears to the total number in the nation.

The next, for the Americanization of the foreign born, the same amount of money, with the proviso that the number of the foreign born in any state in relation to the total number shall be the basis upon which the money shall be spent.

Then a provision that the nation shall encourage the states to equalize opportunities, particularly with reference to the schools in the sparsely settled parts of the country, and it is provided that this appropriation shall be distributed (this is an authorization for an appropriation of \$50,000,000), one half in proportion to the number of children between the ages of six and twenty-one, and one half in relation to the number of public school teachers.

At the end of each of the sections carrying an appropriation or rather the authorization of an appropriation is this statement (I haven't read it in connection with the other sections of the bill, but it appears at the end of each of the sections authorizing appropriations):

"All funds apportioned to a state to equalize educational opportunities" and you may substitute for that the training of teachers, physical education, Americanization and illiteracy "shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the laws of said state in like plans as the funds provided by state and local authorities for the same purpose, and the state and local education authorities of said state shall determine the courses of study, plans and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said state in accordance with the laws thereof."

As you can understand, the proviso is there in order to guarantee the control of the states over their own school systems, but in relation to this authorization of \$50,000,000 appropriation, there is another proviso, which is this:

"That the apportionment authorized by this section shall be made only to such states as by law provide a legal school term of at least twenty-four weeks in each year for the benefit of all of the children of school age in such state." There are children in the United States who get less than that amount of education a year.

"A compulsory school attendance law requiring all children between the ages of seven and fourteen to attend some school for at least twenty-four weeks in each year."

"That the English language shall be the basic language of instruction in the common school branches in all schools, public and private."

In other words, those who are responsible for framing the bill felt that it would not be right to appropriate money to the states if they failed to have children in school, if they failed to provide at least twenty-four weeks of school, and if they sought to have schools conducted or permitted schools to be conducted which in the judgment of those who sat on the commission were not schools preparing people for citizenship in the country making the appropriation.

The next provision is for physical education distributed upon the basis of population. The next for the preparation of teachers distributed upon the basis of the number of public school teachers in the particular state in relation to the number in the nation.

There is a special provision in that section which suggests that people be encouraged to go into teaching through scholarships, the idea being that we in America might some day come to the acceptance of an idea which prevails in other countries, that is, that it is well to subsidize competent people to get them into teaching.

The next section of the bill provides that the state legislature shall accept and designate the state superintendent or commissioner of education to carry out the provisions of the act; that the treasurer shall be the custodian of the funds; that the state and local education authorities shall, together, raise an amount for the purpose specified equal

to that given by the national government; that the sums for the equalization of opportunity, the promotion of physical education and the training of teachers may not be less in the state in any year than the amount appropriated or raised by the states and localities for the year immediately preceding the acceptance of the provisions of this act.

It is important to note that those needs will always continue and that there is no possibility of reducing the amount raised in the states unless it were to allow federal money to be substituted for local and state money, which, of course, is not the thing desired by those who drafted the bill.

It is required that a report be given to the Secretary of Education in order to receive the allotment and then a general covering clause occurs in Section 13, "Provided (*this immediately follows the suggestion that a report must be made in order that the allotments may be secured*) that all of the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a state shall be organized, supervised and administered exclusively by the legally constituted state and local educational authorities of said state, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto, and this act shall not be construed to imply federal control of education within the states nor to impair the freedom of the states in the conduct and management of their respective school systems."

If that could be made any stronger, I am sure an amendment would be acceptable.

The Secretary is authorized in the next section to prepare plans for keeping accounts. It is also proposed that if the money is not spent for the purpose for which it is appropriated, the Secretary shall report to Congress.

It is further provided that a National Council of Education be established and that it shall be composed of the chief administrative officer in every state, not to exceed twenty-five educators, not to exceed twenty-five persons not educators interested in the results of public education, and that the Secretary shall report to Congress.

My first suggestion, then, is read the bill. You can receive, if you will apply to the public printer, reports of the hearings, this particular volume of the House hearings. Here is the argument presented by both sides and at great length. If you cannot get this report from the public printer, the National Education Association has bought a number of hundreds of copies and will provide them for you at cost. Read the bill and then answer the question, "Does the bill provide for the centralizing of the control of education in the government of the United States?" It seems to me that if you are fair minded, you will answer, No, and emphatically, No. Does it provide for any interference by way of the control of courses of study or methods of teaching or the kind of a building or the sort of books or anything else that we commonly think of as important in the conduct of our schools? The answer must be emphatically, No. So we can rid ourselves at the very beginning of our discussion of any suggestion that there was such a desire on the part of anybody or that the bill would make possible the control of education by the central government.

The argument then that remains has first of all been so ably treated by the first speaker that I must invoke his argument and, therefore, shorten my own in that respect.

Shall we have a Department of Education? Our government originally had three executive departments, and only three—State, War, Treasury. There was an Attorney General, but he was not a member of the Cabinet. By 1849 we had seven departments—State, Army, Navy, Treasury, Attorney General, Post Office and Interior. In 1862 we created a Department of Agriculture, and that was the first departure in our government from the earlier provision which made a department of the government an executive department charged with administrative responsibility. The Department of Agriculture had no administrative responsibility other than to administer funds and to issue publications and to stimulate and encourage the

development of agriculture in the United States. In 1867 there was created a Department of Education, within a year, or about that, degraded to its present status of a bureau in the Department of the Interior. In 1889 the head of the Department of Agriculture became the Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of the President. In 1903 we developed the Department of Commerce and Labor. In 1913 we separated that joint department and created the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor.

Shall we have a Department of Education? Why not an enlarged bureau. It has been proposed. I have here on the table a bill which seeks to establish a bureau that shall have larger functions and more support. The answer seems to me perfectly clear. We are today engaged in education as the greatest single government enterprise that we have. All you have to do is to examine the budgets of our cities, of our rural districts, of our states. It is inconceivable that we should go ahead with the belief that we have in education and then think that the issue of education is not an issue which cuts across every other issue of the government.

No man in a bureau, no person in a separate and isolated commission can properly represent the activity of local, state and national government in the field of education. It is only as that individual sits at the council table as a member of the Cabinet that he can possibly adequately represent us in those councils.

Then it is true, whether we want to suggest it as the reason or not, that the prestige which attaches to an office has a significance for the field which is represented. I am not ashamed to propose that a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet would mean a recognition for my profession and a recognition which I sincerely covet for the profession.

In these days of budgets, executive and otherwise, the proper support of the activities in which the department should be engaged, even if you limit that department en-

tirely to research and investigation, would be very much greater with a proper representative in the Cabinet of the President than could be possible with education represented by a bureau chief. A man who could stand for Education when the issue of the budget was up and who would of necessity be called upon to represent this field, could be expected to secure results not possible for a subordinate official asked to make his report through one who might or might not believe in the importance of his undertaking.

I am not afraid of having the Secretary of Education a powerful person in the President's Cabinet. I think that is what people mean when they say he would be a politician, that he would be a powerful individual, that he would be some one who really helped to determine policy, some one who really was looked to for guidance in the affairs of the nation.

We have a rather interesting history in the departments which may properly be called the welfare departments of government, a history almost without exception, of men competent in their particular fields chosen for these particular secretaryships. I have to recall the fact that a single Secretary of Agriculture sat in the Cabinet of the President over a period of twelve years. I suggest that for the benefit of those who feel that the changes in that office would mean lack of continuity and administration. Continuity, after all, is determined by those who are subordinate to the Secretary and the more powerful, the more influential, the more competent the Secretary, the more the hope that those who remain in the service over a long period will be properly supported in the work which they do. Even if it were assured that the term of the Secretary of Education would be no greater than that of other Cabinet officers, I should still desire to see the office a Cabinet office.

There is enough to do. Leaving out all of the activity that has to do with war needs, West Point, the Naval Academy, and other service schools, leaving out the vocational

rehabilitation of soldiers of the late war, we find a budget of more than \$40,000,000 without any additional appropriations being provided.

Now I come to the second issue. Is it legitimate to propose that the policy of the federal government of granting aid to the states be continued and developed? I haven't the time to recall to you the whole history, but just to sketch it. You know, and I think probably you would agree with me, that in the opening up of the new territory in the United States west of Ohio and from then on until all of the states had been admitted, the grants of land were the basis upon which the public school system was established. Say what you will about the way the states handled the land, nevertheless the fact remains that that was the basis, and without it we certainly could not have had the rapid development of the public school system which came.

There are some interesting figures in connection with the colleges of engineering and agriculture. The federal grants to these institutions, beginning, as you remember, in 1863 for the last year for which data are printed, amounted to approximately \$4,000,000. State support in those institutions in the same year amounted to a little more than \$40,000,000. I take it again that it is only fair to assume that the stimulus that came from the government did help to create those institutions and has meant a very great deal in their development throughout the nation. Or a more recent example is vocational education; in 1917 fifteen states gave support for vocational education amounting to \$1,300,000. In 1921, due in very large measure to the stimulus which came from the federal government for vocational education, forty-six states were spending \$14,400,000, while the national government was contributing \$3,100,000. In other words, it is not necessary to propose that the federal government support education in order to get results. We have a wonderful history of securing results which are desired by means of the stimulus which is given when the federal government shows its concern and

encourages the state to undertake to solve the particular problem.

But is it necessary to undertake these particular types of education which are provided for in the bill? I leave the question with you.

The federal census says we have 6 per cent. of our population who are illiterate, and, as you know, the federal census' definition of illiteracy is "Never went to school." I think the army definition of illiteracy was probably a better one; they gave the test to more than a million and found that out of that number, 24.9 per cent. of the men at least could not read simple English. Some of them may have been able to read something else. I think it wouldn't be exaggerating the situation to propose that we have 12 per cent. of our population who are essentially illiterate, unable to get the ideas which you and I get from the ordinary newspaper, unable to understand or to appreciate on their own account and subject merely to the suggestion which comes to them from some other source, the quack, the person who seeks to influence them without any possibility of their responding by reading.

I think we need to remove illiteracy and it seems to me it is an issue that the nation cannot afford to neglect. We have approximately 14,000,000 of foreign born. Our programs for the Americanization of this part of our population have been inadequate. We need much of investigation, much of study, of how to do the job better, and we need to undertake it on a very much more generous scale than we have done heretofore.

The training of teachers. We are alone, practically, in the world in our attitude as a nation toward the issue of having trained teachers in our schools. The latest data that are available secured from the states and from the localities within the states show 54 per cent. of our teachers having less than what may be termed a minimum standard training for their work, less than a minimum of graduation from high school and two years of professional training. Surely

if there is any one thing that we need in the United States today more than another it is provision to get people into training as teachers and the salaries necessary to keep them there after we have trained them.

The equalization of opportunity. I would like to have all of the thirty minutes to discuss that issue, because there in the last analysis we get right down to the place where either we agree in principle, or disagreeing in principle there is no need for further argument.

The states vary in their ability to support education. How great that variability is I don't suppose any of us can finally determine, but we have at least on the authority of the Bureau of Economic Research this fact, based upon the most careful investigations that have ever been made, that the per capita income in one state is as little as \$345, and in another the per capita income is \$874. Now I propose to you that you cannot reconcile that difference. If the welfare of this nation is to be in any degree determined by the opportunity which is provided for education, then clearly the nation as such has an obligation to help the states to carry out the program of education which we need for all American boys and girls. It won't do to say that the poorer states don't care; it won't do to propose that if they were only willing to tax themselves they could do all that is necessary. There are, among the poorest states, states today that are paying a larger percentage of their income for public education than are the wealthiest states in the union.

Will the bill do any good? If you will take all of the states that fall below the median or the average in income per capita, and then calculate the amount of taxes which they pay in terms of federal income taxes and internal revenue taxes, then relate the amount that would come to them from the provisions of this act if it were enacted into law, you will find that all of those states, save one, would get more than it paid. I reach that conclusion, of course, by taking the percentage of the total amount paid in and

then taking the percentage of the amount that would come from the hundred million, if it were all appropriated, which they would receive. I find with the single exception of North Carolina, every one of those states would receive a larger proportion of the grant as made than they pay of the total of income taxes and internal revenue taxes.

Well, that means just what we must always expect to have happen when we levy taxes nationally and distribute them upon any sound basis to the states. The wealthier states do pay more than they get back, and, of course, they should. The other states, the poorer states, do get more than they pay in, and, of course, if we have a national purpose in mind, they should.

What I am really asking you to accept is this: that we are a nation and not merely an aggregation of independent principalities; that we have a stake nationally in education, that the mobility of our population, whether you apply it to a migration of negroes from the South to the North, or to the migration of men trained in your colleges, demands that we consider education on a national basis.

This is the fundamental issue. The welfare of all of us demands that finally, as a matter of evolution of our practice with respect to the support of education, we accept the principle of national support for education. We have accepted taxation locally to support schools, taxation in the state to support schools. We shall have to accept finally taxation in the nation for public schools.

I can't quit without paying my respects to those who fear the breakdown of the constitution and the interference with the rights of the states. That particular type of argument has been used against every reform that has been proposed from the earliest days down to the present.

May I quote from Dean Roscoe Pound in a different connection but, nevertheless, pertinent to this argument. "We certainly have never had a greater lawyer in this country than James Kent, but he thundered against the Louisiana purchase as unconstitutional, revolutionary, and subversive

of American institutions." I think that type of argument is the type that we shall always have to expect from those who are not yet ready to take the next step forward.

Or may I quote from President Roosevelt in a statement made in 1907. "State's rights should be preserved when they mean the people's rights, . . . but not when they stand for wrong or repression of any kind or for national weakness or impotence at home or abroad."

I confidently believe that we shall have education represented in the Cabinet of the President, and just so certainly as we hold to the American ideal of giving a square deal to all, just so certainly as we believe in equalizing opportunity, we shall sooner or later accept the principle of national support.

Negative

DR. CHARLES H. JUDD,

Director, School of Education, University of Chicago

I want to say at the outset that I have just as much respect for the cabinet as anybody, perhaps more than some of you. I am not here to praise the nation; I am here to debate a bill that was expounded to you but not discussed before you. This bill proposes a method of procedure. If we want to save this nation because we are devoted to it, we must have a method of procedure, and this bill that is under discussion this morning, or ought to have been under discussion, is a bill that proposes a method of procedure.

This bill was presented to you by the gentleman who preceded me with certain comments which I suppose were intended to attract your attention as indicating that the bill was drawn by authorities, so-and-so many state superintendents, so-and-so many city superintendents, somebody who withdrew because he didn't like it, and so on. Now what did those gentlemen do? Those gentlemen went up to Capitol Hill and saw Senator Smith. Senator Smith said, "I have drawn some very good bills before this, and if you

gentlemen want anything along this line, you will draw this bill the way I drew my last bill." The last bill that he drew was the Smith-Hughes Bill, to which reference has been made. The Smith-Hughes Bill provides quite explicitly that any funds given for industrial and vocational education to the various states shall be supervised by a federal board for vocational education. It provides explicitly that all plans that are adopted by the states shall be approved by this federal board.

That was the form, ladies and gentlemen, in which the first draft of this bill was made. It provided explicitly that there shall be supervision by the proposed new secretary in the cabinet of all the plans under which the funds provided in the bill shall be expended. In other words, the wisdom of this body that proposed to us a method of procedure was the wisdom of an earlier piece of legislation. That bill, when so drawn as to give the secretary power of control, was so vigorously criticized by school people who had experienced the operation of the Smith-Hughes Bill that shortly after it was drawn, to be explicit, from the time of the second draft on, not from the time of the formulation of the bill, the bill has been of an entirely different character, and its defense has been made vigorously, as you have heard it made this morning, in terms of a protest that the federal government shall not control.

For my part, I am not a bit afraid of federal control when it is exercised properly, and you will note that this bill does exercise federal control at three points, and I think advantageously. It provides that there shall be a certain number of weeks in the school year before any of the federal funds can be accepted. It provides for the English language, a provision which could not be directly enacted by the Congress of the United States, but is indirectly enacted in a bill of this sort by attaching it to an appropriation.

The point I want to make is that we are debating a method of procedure, we are not debating the cabinet, we

are not debating the nation at all, we are asking whether this particular bill provides advantageous modes of procedure for carrying out the general policy that we are interested in carrying out in favor of education.

Let us come back to the bill. This bill does not state what elements shall be included in the new department beyond the single statement that the present Bureau of Education shall be so included. We have been told quite explicitly here this morning, and repeatedly in earlier discussions, that the reason for the omission of the other department was that educators didn't think it desirable to have a controversy. There was a controversy on at the time that this commission met for the first formulation of this bill. It is one of the most fundamental controversies that has appeared in American education, it is the controversy between a dual and a unit organization of our American schools.

There was passed a few years before the first draft of this bill a bill that was intended by its proponents to separate vocational education from general academic education. The federal government gave money to vocational education and provided an agency for the supervision of vocational education which was separate from the Bureau of Education, and as I have said, the proponents of that Smith-Hughes Bill were emphatically, distinctly, repeatedly in favor of a separate type of organization for training young people in vocational and industrial lines.

That bill which had been enacted by the federal government, creating the Smith-Hughes federal board of vocational education, was on the statute books when this commission met. The suggestion was made to this commission that the Smith-Hughes board should be brought into the new organization proposed. The then director of the Smith-Hughes board appeared before the commission and told them he would oppose the bill if they tried to include his board, and they didn't include his board. In other words, the commission failed to face the fact that one of the fundamental issues in American education is the issue of

a unit or a dual organization. The federal board is now willing to be included. They have been knocked about sufficiently to find out that they can't control the United States. They are willing to come back into the new organization at the present time. Any courage on the part of the commission in its first draft of that bill would have gone very far to have carried the United States much earlier, in its policy of vocational education, to the type of conclusion to which it has come.

We are debating a method, ladies and gentlemen, we are asking whether this bill tells how a department of education shall be set up, we are not debating the general question, whether there shall be a department. We are asking whether this bill tells the kind of department to which we can subscribe.

There are some unsettled questions even at the present time, and those are the questions that educators have sooner or later got to have some kind of an opinion upon. For example, this bill does not say what disposition shall be made of the educational activities of the department of agriculture. This bill does not say what disposition shall be made of the educational interests of the department of labor. This bill leaves that to be settled by Congress, without any advice from educators. Educators have no policy in this matter which they are prepared to present to Congress by way of advice. Educators draft a general bill which includes one item only, namely, the bureau of education.

My statement, I think, is no exaggeration when I say that the educational world goes before Congress inarticulate on a number of the major issues of federal interest in education. The educational world so far as this particular bill is concerned has been so non-committal that we now find ourselves in a position of raising a question whether the bureau of pensions shall be included in the new department, and that because we have made no official pronouncement on any question whatsoever in the only bill that goes for-

yard as our representative bill. We left all questions for Congress and for those who are interested in other types of organizations.

My contention is that any bill representing the educational world should have been clear and distinct and emphatic on general lines of policy. If there were disagreements among us, those ought to have been clearly faced; those ought to have been so clearly faced and so clearly defined that if there are major methods of procedure in debate, those should have come to the front.

I must comment on one or two other items. We are talking about methods of procedure. We have been told that federal money is necessary for the maintenance of the school. Now mark you, we are not debating that question, we are debating the question whether this bill takes that federal money and disposes of it advantageously. We are debating a method, for the bill is a method of procedure and distribution.

I listened with a good deal of interest while you were hearing a synopsis of the bill. I thought it might be advantageous for both of us to have a copy of the bill, so I also brought one along. Did you notice the interesting fact that this is a bill which disposes of money by various formulas? Now the formula for the disposition of money is just as important a subject for legislative consideration as the amount of money. May I stop and comment casually on questions relating to the amounts of money? Why do we have \$7,500,000 for this subject, and \$15,000,000 for another subject and \$50,000,000 for another subject? Why those particular amounts? Is there a definite statement of fundamental principle? We have been teaching school superintendents for some time in school administration that if they go before a board of education and make a proposal, they ought to go with reasons and definite reasons for the financial amount that they suggest to that board of education. You will notice round figures that are used occasionally in this particular bill.

Let me come to the formula in detail; after you have got some of these round figures settled, these large funds of money have to be disposed of. How do you dispose of them? Let's take one section that disposes of the money that is to be given to illiterates. That was emphasized by the speaker who preceded me. "Said sum shall be apportioned to the states in the proportion to which their respective illiterate population of ten years of age and over, not including foreign born illiterates, bears to such total illiterate population of the United States, not including outlying territories," and so on.

That is a perfectly reasonable formula, isn't it? If you have illiterates, go and take care of them; if you have more in one part of the country go and take care of them and concentrate your energy on that section of illiterates. You appropriate money for illiterates in terms of needs of the states. That is a perfectly clear principle.

Turn over to Section 12, which deals with traing of teachers. That is the section that has been praised before you and on the whole, it a great, worthy enterprise to train teachers, isn't it? "The funds provided in this particular clause shall be used to provide and extend facilities for the improvement of teachers already in service and for the more adequate preparation of prospective teachers and to provide an increased number of trained and competent teachers."

It is perfectly clear that you need an increased number of trained and competent teachers, and the bill is unquestionably right at that point. "Encourage through the establishment of scholarships and otherwise a greater number of young people to make adequate preparation for public school service.

"The said sum shall be apportioned to the states in the proportions which the number of public school teachers employed in teaching positions in the respective states bears to the total number of public school teachers." That is, if you have plenty of public school teachers now, take some

money and encourage some more people to go in. If you haven't got any teachers, as a number of the frontier states haven't, if you are really quite destitute of them, we are sorry, we haven't any federal money for you, the federal money is to go to Massachusetts, New York, and some of these states where they have plenty of teachers. If you have illiterates, we will come to your aid.

Gentlemen, this is a bill offered to the Congress of the United States, representing the mature judgment of a commission of educators made of so-and-so many state superintendents, so-and-so many city superintendents, and one man who didn't like the bill. (*Laughter.*)

The point I am trying to make with you is that we are dealing with a method of procedure. When was this bill drawn? This bill was drawn in 1918, at a time when we had the Overman Law. You remember the Overman Law. The Overman Law said that the Commander of our Armies and Navies, incidentally, the President of the United States, shall do what he wants to so, if he has any federal organizations he does not approve, that does not promise to save our lives and our country, he may change them. That was what the Overman Law said. That is what the first part of this bill comes from, we were full of the Overman Law.

We have in the Stirling-Reed Bill, a bill that says we want to put in the bureau of education; that we know about, the rest of it we don't know about; we haven't any time to settle the question, let somebody settle it who has power and wisdom in this matter. If he thinks he can get the federal board in without too much quarrel, or if he thinks he can get in the department of agriculture or somebody else without too much quarrel, all right, we are glad to have him do it, but we are not going to get into any trouble about that bill. That requires wisdom and that requires power, and we are not going to bother with that. (*Laughter.*) And that bill has not been amended in that particular since 1918 when it was drawn at a time when the Overman Law was in the minds of all of us.

We were told at that time, too, that the public schools would go to pieces if they didn't have some money and have it right off. I am bound to say it looked very much as if that were the case. We were losing teachers because all of the industries were able to take teachers at more salary than we could pay, and we certainly were all of us afraid—I think I might appeal to the experience of an assembly of this sort, many of us were very grateful to the federal government for organizing the students into army corps and paying us for keeping them. Certainly it helped us out in many instances, and hundreds of millions of dollars at that time were very much appreciated when they came our way. We went to Washington as educators and we said, "What shall we do to save this nation?" At that time the nation had practically all the money there was anyway, and we paid such taxes as we could afford to pay and we looked forward to paying more taxes and everything went into the federal treasury and then we got as much back as we were able to. We were talking about big sums of money and we weren't talking very carefully about details. We talked about \$100,000,000 in those days with a good deal of fluency and there was very little discussion at that time of federal economy. There was no administration that had told us explicitly again and again that the kind of a law which this bill proposes can not be passed. We have since had the President of the United States repeat to us several times; in the midst of a presidential campaign when he didn't know how much of a majority he was going to get that federal appropriations to the states will not be made. He told the educators quite explicitly that the federal government would not make appropriations to the states, so far as his wisdom and judgment could be applied to the situation.

We have been told again and again that that financial part of this bill can not be put through. I am not going to quote any less authority than one of the sponsors for the bill. At the installation of President Kinley, of the University of Illinois, Judge Towner, who for a long time has

been identified with the bill, said that the financial part of this bill was not at the present time under discussion, but we hear it discussed.

Remember, we are talking about a method, we are talking about a particular bill, we are not talking about the nation or the cabinet. We are talking about the possibilities of helping education by tying together two issues. I think I am quoting one of the speakers roughly where a powerful Senator said, "I will not vote for a member of the cabinet unless I can get some money for my state, unless he can carry with him a very large fund of money." You remember what the date of that remark was, that was 1918. That Senator isn't there any more, by the way, and there is an administration now in power that talks in other terms, and has asked us as educators by every possible implication and statement to be clear and distinct about what we want.

What is it that we want? Do we want the money or the cabinet officer? We are not talking about cabinet officers in general, gentlemen, we are talking about a bill that ties those two things together and says, "If you take with your right hand the cabinet officer, with your left hand you will have to take this money." We are debating a bill which puts those two things together, and in the face of a request and a demand and a debate that have been carried on endlessly for six years.

For six years we have been asking that there be clearness in the educational world and a separation of issues. We are asking those who are our representatives in this matter to so clearly distinguish these two items that we may debate them separately, that we may go before Congress with the fundamental theory that there is a necessity of public support for schools. We want to go before this Congress with a perfectly clear statement of all of these fundamental facts about taxation; we want to go before Congress and debate this problem of federal policy with regard to state subsidy, but you can't debate them if three-quarters of the time is spent praising the cabinet and seven minutes praising the

financial part of the bill, because this bill is one bill made up of two parts which the authorities in charge of the bill have refused to separate. They have been asked again and again and again in the interests of sheer intellectual clarity as well as political expediency to divide these two parts of the bill and debate them separately.

We are debating a bill, ladies and gentlemen, we are not debating general issues, we are talking about a method of procedure. Is it wise to put into one bill an appropriation for \$100,000,000 and in the other part of the bill one of our most fundamental governmental interests, the organization of a department and a secretary in the President's cabinet?

My contention is that the bill is fundamentally wrong, and my contention is that the statements that were made in 1918 were wrong. Will you let me prove that to you briefly? We were told that our schools were going to go to pieces. Well, you can find them now still in existence; furthermore, you find those schools supported. How have they been supported? They have been supported by communities that have seen the necessity of putting into the support of these schools very much larger funds than in 1918 they thought they could possibly afford.

Let us consider the ratio of elementary and secondary school expenditure in 1920 as contrasted with 1910. That ratio for Arizona is 671%. That is really more of an increase than has occurred in most of our private budgets in the same interim. Arizona has expended 671% in a single decade in order to support public education. What is going along with that? Why an intense consideration on the part of the communities in Arizona of the importance of education.

Mr. Fisher has just said of us that education is the American religion, and so it is, and how does it come to be the American religion? It has come to be the American religion because in every little hamlet and every town and every state, even on the frontier, the people have been called upon from time to time to make up their minds whether they will

make genuine sacrifices for education, and they have responded in the last decade in Arizona in the ratio of 671%.

I am not arguing that this is a solution of the whole matter, but I am saying that in 1918 we went to Congress and said, "Our schools can not be maintained unless this federal money is put in." And in 1925 those schools are still in existence and we are all eagerly interested to see them improved.

In like fashion, I hold that it is not an argument for this particular bill to say that we are all of us eager for equality of educational opportunity. The question is, does this bill provide equality of educational opportunity? Let's take a few cases. I hold a very important document in my hand. I may say it is the official output of a commission that has invested educational finance; the highest authorities in the land contributed to it. What are some of the facts with regard to these different states? The state that has the highest per capita expenditure for elementary and secondary education is the state of Montana where they spent \$22.23 per capita. Why? Well, if you have ever had to cross Montana you know why. They have to look around for somebody to spend this money on and they spend so much time and effort hunting up people that it costs a great deal more to spend that money than it does anywhere else. But, now, remember, Montana is spending \$22. Let's take some of our other states, for example. The state of Illinois is spending \$10 only, or to be exact, \$10.65. The per capita in these different states is very different.

When you have computed those per capitas do you get any perfectly clear, vivid notion of the quality of education that goes with it? That is, should we debate these questions of equality of opportunity in terms of the numbers of dollars and cents that are spent? Or, let's take the question of supervision. Obviously the bill is very careful to avoid supervision. We mustn't have any supervision, that is dangerous, that is harmful, the federal government might do something that would improve you against your will.

That must not be risked. If any state wants to take this money and do what it likes with it, that it may do, that is all right; as soon as it gets across the border out of the federal treasury, then we are not going to control it any more, absolutely not. The states can do what they like, that will equalize education. Can't you see how this method of equalizing education will work in some states? It will equalize something; it will equalize revenues, it will equalize some salaries, it will equalize a good many things. Perhaps it would have been more modest had I taken another state besides Illinois, but Illinois is a little less than half as much in expenditure as the state of Montana.

We are debating a method, ladies and gentlemen. Are you going to settle the method of efficiency and equality of opportunity by dollars and cents? Is that the way that equality of opportunity is to be secured, or are we to secure equality of opportunity by some sort of exchange of better methods of organization, by comparisons of content of instruction, by encouragement to the people in the different parts of the country to carry on education at a higher level?

I have one more item to make. It is an ungracious task, you know, to talk about a bill, especially when there is no necessity of talking about it. There is no probability that this bill will ever get out of committee or ever will be passed, but it is an interesting subject to discuss. It has been before us for six years; each year we have been told that it was just on the point of passing, we have been told each year that it is *the* center of Congressional discussion; we have been told each year, well, we have been told a great many things, and the bill is still in committee.

I say it is rather ungracious to talk about a bill of that sort, but one must talk about the bill because that was the subject assigned for this debate, and I have tried to stick to it. This bill is an interesting composite of many minds, several of them added themselves to the original minds that drafted the bill; as I indicated to you, Senator Smith has gone now, and a number of the other people have gone, and

I am going to mention one or two names in few moments that represent other absentees in the discussion.

This bill authorizes an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for this general purpose of equalization of educational opportunity. The commission that decided to insert \$50,000,000 debated quite a while what would be most attractive to Congress as a purpose on which to spend this \$50,000,000. They said they needed the \$50,000,000 and they would be more likely to get it if Congress could be persuaded to give it to them. How could they persuade Congress? They said, "We had better get hold of Congress and find out what they like most." Somebody said, "They will always fall for any legislation that has to do with rural communities. All right, we will put that in, that is a good thing," and the bill was drawn up specifying several topics including rural education on which you could spend \$50,000,000 if you had it. But that didn't please all the members of the community in the United States. There was a group of people who felt they could use the \$50,000,000 and they intended to have a say-so about it.

May I read you a clause from the fourth annual report of Mr. Stillman, the President of the Teachers' Federation? "When that bill known as the Smith Bill appeared, we" (that is the Teachers' Federation) "went over it carefully and systematically, but to our amazement found no mention of teachers' salaries in the language of the bill. Friends of the bill insisted that the \$50,000,000 for improvement of schools covered the matter of salaries adequately, since there were provisions that no part of it could be expended for school buildings, school indebtedness and so forth, and that by a process of exclusion most of the \$50,000,000 would necessarily go to teachers' salaries. That indirectness and the philosophy behind it that it was beneath our professional dignity to mention anything so sordid as teachers' salaries in black and white was highly unsatisfactory to us, and when I put the matter before Secretary Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, he said that labor could

not get behind a piece of camouflage of that kind," and he asked the American Federation of Teachers to draft a bill that labor could support.

"On the evening of January 10, 1919, the National Popular Government League arranged an educational program as part of their reconstruction congress. Upon the program Mr. Hugh Magill, who had been made field secretary of the National Education Association a few days before, represented the National Education Association, and I represented the American Federation of Teachers. At that meeting Mr. Magill asked me if we couldn't get together on a federal legislative program. Mr. Lansing and I held several conferences with Mr. Magill and other National Education Association officials during the next three days. Our first demand as a prerequisite for the support of the American Federation of Teachers and through us the support of the American Federation of Labor was the inclusion in the language of the bill of partial payments of teachers' salaries. Mr. Macgill accepted that gladly," and to-day teachers' salaries stand as the first item under the \$50,000,000 that is going to secure equalization of American opportunity for school children. (*Applause.*)

Reply

DR. STRAYER: I am perfectly willing to leave the the issue as to whether or not I debated the bill to you. In my own judgment I did nothing else.

I don't believe that the persons who sat on the commission that drafted the bill need any defense, but for fear you might not consider them worthy representatives of the profession, I am going to trouble you to let you know who they were.

Robert J. Aley, then President of the University of Maine.

Sarah Louise Arnold, Dean of the Simmons College in Boston at that time.

W. C. Bagley, professor Teachers College Columbia University.

F. D. Boynton, Superintendent of Schools of Ithaca, New York.

Mary C. Bradford, State Superintendent of Colorado.

J. A. Chandler, then Superintendent of Schools in Richmond, Va.

L. D. Coffman, University of Minnesota.

George B. Cook, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Ellwood P. Cubberley, Leland Stanford University.

Agnes E. Dougherty, Teacher, St. Paul.

Susan M. Dorsey, Supt. of Schools, Los Angeles, Calif.

David Felmley, Principal of Normal School, Normal, Ill.

Thomas E. Finegan, then State Superintendent of Pennsylvania.

Joseph M. Gwinn, Superintendent of Schools in New Orleans.

Ada V. S. Harris, Assistant in Pittsburgh, Pa.

E. C. Hartwell, Supt. of Schools, Buffalo, N. Y.

Henry W. Holmes, Dean of the School of Education, Harvard University.

W. A. Jessup, President University of Iowa.

J. Y. Joyner, State Superintendent, N. C.

A. J. Mathews, Principal of Normal School in Arizona.

W. B. Owen, Chicago Teachers' College.

C. G. Pearse, then President of Milwaukee Teachers' College.

Mrs. J. C. Preston, State Superintendent, Washington.

W. L. Siders, Superintendent of Schools, Idaho.

Payson Smith, State Superintendent, Boston, Mass.

F. E. Spaulding, Superintendent in Cleveland, Ohio.

Nina Vandewalker, Kindergarten Director, Milwaukee State Teachers College.

John W. Withers, Superintendent of Schools in St. Louis.

George D. Strayer, Teachers College, Columbia University.

I really don't think that that group needs any defense from me. It isn't fair to propose that they did not debate the issues; they did. They may have erred. We never thought that we were omniscient. We felt—the discussion lasted over many days, many different meetings were held—that a Department of Education might properly be considered an evolution and that it was not necessary something that could be brought to pass over night. I am not at all persuaded that we would have been wiser had we taken some other course.

There was no pronouncement, said the opposite speaker, on the question of including the Bureau of Pensions, and yet it is a well understood fact in Washington that the bill to create a Department of Welfare was killed because of the attack then made by this commission and by those who were supporting the Department of Education. We did have some very definite idea as to what ought to prevail.

Round numbers, yes; when your bill authorizes an appropriation which must run the gamut of an appropriations committee, probably round numbers are just as good as odd ones, because, after all, the issue of an appropriation isn't settled in the bill which authorizes it.

Apportioning money on the basis of the number of teachers seems to me a pretty good way. If you get more teachers, you get more money, and, of course, that is what my worthy opponent wanted the states to have happen to them. In other words, the bill did not propose that the government was going to stand the whole cost, but it did hope to encourage them. I know no better way to encourage more than to say, if you do more, you get more.

The law cannot be passed. There are some things more important than passing a law. Among them, I consider the issue of whether or not we shall accept a principle. Whether it was wise or not to include in the same measure the creation of a Department which meant proper recognition of Education, and further federal support; I say whether that was wise or not, I consider them both fundamental.

I don't know of any way that equality of opportunity can be brought about except by furnishing the funds necessary. It is a fine thing that the states have done more, much more than they did formerly, and yet with the latest statistics that we have from the Bureau of Education, it appears that there are states in which the average salaries of rural school teachers today are less than \$400 a year. I think anything that would encourage the states to improve that condition is worth undertaking.

I believe that the American people will give us both results that we have sought eventually. I expect that we will have a Department of Education before we have further federal support, but when the period of reaction in which we are now living is over (and it will be over some day), when we can have a little bit more of idealism than we have with us right now, we shall again acknowledge the responsibility of all of us for providing education for all the children of the United States.

REPLY

DR. JUDD: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to take the opportunity not to continue the debate. As I said at the outset it is rather ungracious to spend your time attacking a bill. I am not particularly interested on the negative side of the matter. I was very much interested in the invitation to appear before a group of this sort for the purpose of pointing your interest as definitely as I can in a discussion of national educational issues.

We are all agreed (let us set aside some of the negatives) that we have great national issues in education; we are all agreed, too, that there will have to be found some method of meeting those issues.

I believe it is perfectly clear that the federal government can undertake for us various lines of activities which we can not undertake locally. I am perfectly certain that the federal government has, for example, in agriculture, done

a great deal for localities that never could do with themselves. If we can set in motion in the educational group here the type of thinking that will get behind a federal agency that shall give information to people about what they are accomplishing and what are the best methods of accomplishment in other parts of the country, I believe we shall have a great deal more efficient method of improving American education than by giving people dollars. Information is what education needs, a broad type of information, something that our Bureau of Education has never been able to collect up to this time.

I believe in a strong federal agency that shall be able to inform all of the communities of this country, exactly as we do in agriculture, on all of the essential questions of education. Why can't we get together on that? Mr. Strayer has said, and I think he actually believes and everybody else associated with him believes that a federal department of education has got to be an evolution. I believe that, too. The great difficulty with this bill is that we haven't been able to evolve it very much. For example, if you will allow me a personal remark, I was asked back in 1920 what I would do about teachers, and so I drafted a particular clause that might have been introduced into a bill. I don't think it is an infallible clause by any means. Have we ever had any consideration of that sort of thing seriously? No. We have had no modification in essential characteristics on grounds such as those that have been presented this morning. We have had no modification of this bill; we have had no evolution of it, we have been told all the time that Congress would tend to the evolution of the bill, Congress will decide this, Congress will decide that. I am for inducing educational people to talk about a first-class bill, and then I am willing to join Mr. Strayer or anybody else in the contention that we ought to have an evolution of the bill, we ought to have a bill that is evolving by your interests and discussions.

You know the American Council when it asked for a referendum vote on this bill found that the colleges were

indifferent, found that the colleges didn't know anything about the bill. I don't know how many of you read that bill before Mr. Strayer gave you the synopsis of it. I had the opportunity a few years ago to meet with a couple of hundred people who were the administrative officers in one of the neighboring states—school superintendents. They had just endorsed the bill. I got up and asked, "How many of you know the major provisions of that bill? How many have read the bill or synopsis of it?" There were only six out of that group of 200 that had just endorsed the bill who knew its contents.

How many of you before this morning knew in any detail the content of the bill? Will you let me have a show of hands? As near as I can count there are thirty-four people of this audience, and you are the leading educators of the United States! Why shouldn't the leading educators of the United States, representatives of our higher institutions, get behind this measure by the most intense thinking about the best method of organizing a federal agency for education? That is the only reason I am here. I don't have any interest in being classified as a negative. I was pretty nearly classified as a sum total negative here by the Secretary. He put in your preliminary program that I was going to debate on the negative of the proposal for a federal department. I am not opposed to a department. I am asking every time I get an opportunity in public and in private that educational people shall discuss the method by which the Federal Government can be most effective in education.

There are some people in this room who do not believe in a department. All right, why shouldn't we hear them hospitably? Why shouldn't we say, "What are the advantages of your sort of thinking, the enlargement of the Bureau, for example?"

I am willing to listen to any man who has a way of doing this thing if he will give me a reason for it, and the only reason I, and a great many of the rest of us are eager to see a debate carried on, is that we want an evolution of that

bill and we want it evolved so far out of its present crude, purely political character that it shall be a real bill representing the educational people. That can not happen until the educational people take an interest in it. The reason we are here is to try to send everybody back to the various institutions from which you come to gather together your associates in your faculties and say the federal government of the United States and our institutions are engaged in the same kind of a job, namely, making the United States the best country in the world.

I could deliver a peroration on the need of equalization of education, on the president and his cabinet or on the nation, as could anybody else in the place, and I could talk with just as much enthusiasm as anybody else, but it is much more important that we see to it that the method by which we attack these great federal resources shall be defined by educators and not left in blanket form by educators to be settled by somebody who doesn't know education and who regards educators as higher forms of hired servants. Let's not put this major interest of America, education and its contact with the federal government, into the hands of people who are not specialists, while we go about our particular jobs, ignorant of the details of a proposal that has been before the United States Congress for six years and which we have been told every year is just about to become the law of the land controlling our relation to that federal government. (*Applause.*)